arXiv:1210.0583v1 [math.CA] 1 Oct 2012

EXTREMIZERS FOR FOURIER RESTRICTION INEQUALITIES: CONVEX ARCS

DIOGO OLIVEIRA E SILVA

Abstract. We establish the existence of extremizers for a Fourier restriction inequality on planar convex arcs without points with colinear tangents whose curvature satisfies a natural assumption. More generally, we prove that any extremizing sequence of nonnegative functions has a subsequence which converges to an extremizer.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. The cap estimate 4
3. The decomposition algorithm 7
4. A geometric property of the decomposition 11
5. Upper bounds for extremizing sequences 14
6. A concentration compactness result 17
7. Exploring concentration 20
8. Comparing optimal constants 24
8.1. Introducing local coordinates 24
8.2. The unperturbed case 25
8.3. A variational calculation 27
9. The end of the proof 34
10. Appendix 1: $\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6$ is twice differentiable at $\epsilon = 0$ 35
11. Appendix 2: Two explicit calculations 43
References 45

1. Introduction

Consider a compact arc $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of a smooth, convex curve equipped with arclength measure σ. Assume the curvature κ of Γ to be positive everywhere; equivalently, assume that $\lambda := \min_\Gamma \kappa$ is a positive real number. Let $\ell := \sigma(\Gamma)$ and parametrize Γ by arclength:

Date: October 3, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42A05.

Key words and phrases. Extremizers, optimal constants, restriction theorem, stationary phase.

The author was partially supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT/Portugal grant SFRH/BD/28041/2006) and the National Science Foundation under agreement DMS-0901569.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\gamma:[0,\ell] & \to & \mathbb{R}^2\\ s & \mapsto & \gamma(s)=(x(s),y(s)).\end{array}$$

For $s\in[0,\ell]$, let $t(s)=(x'(s),y'(s))$ be the tangent indicatrix and let $\theta(s)\in S^1$ measure the net rotation described by the vector $t(s)$ as we run the curve γ from 0 to s. In other words, if we let $e_1=(1,0)$, then θ is the unique continuous function satisfying $t(s)=(\cos\theta(s),\sin\theta(s))$ for every $s\in[0,\ell]$, and such that $\theta(0)=\arccos(e_1\cdot t(0))$. The function θ is related to the curvature κ via

$$\theta(s)=\int_0^s\kappa(t)dt.$$

We further assume that the arc Γ has no points with colinear tangents[1] i.e. points $\gamma(s_0),\gamma(s_1)\in\Gamma$ for which $t(s_0)=-t(s_1)$. By compactness, this means that there exists some constant $\delta_0>0$ such that

$$|t(s)+t(s')|\geq\delta_0,\ \ \forall s,s'\in[0,\ell]. \tag{1}$$

Certain subsets of Γ will be of special interest to us. A cap $\mathcal{C}\subset\Gamma$ is a set of the form

$$\mathcal{C}=\mathcal{C}(s,r)=\{\gamma(s')\in\Gamma:|s-s'|<r\}$$

for some $s\in[0,\ell]$ and $r>0$. We will write $|\mathcal{C}|:=\sigma(\mathcal{C})$.

The space $L^2(\sigma)$ consists of all functions $f:\Gamma\to\mathbb{C}$ for which the quantity

$$\|f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}:=\int_\Gamma|f(z)|^2d\sigma(z)$$

is finite. Given $f\in L^2(\sigma)$, the Fourier transform of the measure $f\sigma$ is defined as

$$\widehat{f\sigma}(x,t):=\int_\Gamma f(z)e^{-i(x,t)\cdot z}d\sigma(z).$$

The Tomas-Stein inequality [26], whose proof we recall in the next section, states that there exists a finite constant $\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]<\infty$ for which

$$\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)}\leq\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \tag{2}$$

for every $f\in L^2(\sigma)$; by $\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]$ we mean the optimal constant defined by

$$\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]:=\sup_{0\neq f\in L^2(\sigma)}\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6\|f\|^{-1}_{L^2(\sigma)}.$$

Definition 1. *An* extremizing sequence *for the inequality* (2) *is a sequence* $\{f_n\}$ *of functions in* $L^2(\sigma)$ *satisfying* $\|f_n\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\leq1$ *such that* $\|\widehat{f_n\sigma}\|_6\to\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]$ *as* $n\to\infty$. *An* extremizer *for the inequality* (2) *is a nonzero function* $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ *which satisfies* $\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6=\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}$.

Definition 2. *A nonzero function* $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ *is said to be a* δ-near extremizer *for the inequality* (2) *if* $\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6\geq(1-\delta)\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}$.

---

[1] We hope to remove this assumption in a later work.

A natural question is whether extremizers exist. More generally one can ask if extremizing sequences are precompact in $L^2(\sigma)$. Previous work includes the study of extremizers for Strichartz/Fourier restriction inequalities in [15], [13] and [7]. Kunze [15] proved the existence of extremizers for the parabola in $\mathbb{R}^2$ by showing that any nonnegative extremizing sequence is precompact. Foschi [13], whose work will be recalled in greater detail in §8, showed that Gaussians are extremizers for this situation and computed the corresponding optimal constant. The best constant and extremizers for the paraboloid in $\mathbb{R}^3$ were also computed in [13]. The existence of extremizers for the restriction on the sphere S^2 was proved by Christ and Shao in [7], and this is to the best of our knowledge the only result concerning existence of extremizers for the endpoint restriction problem on a compact manifold.

Other results on (non-)existence of extremizers and/or computation of sharp constants for Fourier restriction operators and Strichartz inequalities can be found in [4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 21, 22].

Here is our main result:

Theorem 3. *Let Γ be a compact arc of a smooth, convex curve in the plane without points with colinear tangents, equipped with arclength measure σ. Assume that the curvature κ of Γ is a strictly positive function. If the second derivative of the curvature with respect to arclength satisfies*

$$\frac{d^2\kappa}{ds^2}(p_0) < \frac{3}{2}\kappa(p_0)^3 \tag{3}$$

at every $p_0 \in \Gamma$ which is a global minimum of the curvature, then any extremizing sequence of nonnegative functions in $L^2(\sigma)$ for the inequality (2) is precompact.

It is natural to ask about the significance of the geometric condition (3). For instance, if it is not satisfied, does this mean that extremizers fail to exist? While we are at the moment unable to provide a complete answer to this question, we analyze the situation in which condition (3) fails in a rather strong sense in the companion paper [19], and establish a complementary (negative) result along these lines.

We conclude this section by briefly outlining the structure of this paper and giving an idea of the proof of Theorem 3.

In the next section we follow the classical argument of Carleson and Sjölin [3] to prove the Tomas-Stein inequality (2). Using the analysis of a certain bilinear form from [17, 21], we establish the following refinement:

$$\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^{1-\beta/2} \sup_{\mathcal{C}\subset\Gamma} \Big(|\mathcal{C}|^{-1/4}\int_{\mathcal{C}} |f|^{3/2} d\sigma\Big)^{\beta/3}, \tag{4}$$

where the supremum ranges over all caps $\mathcal{C} \subset \Gamma$ and $\beta > 0$ is a small universal constant.

We use estimate (4) in §3 to describe an iterative procedure which takes a nonnegative function $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ as input and produces a sequence of functions $\{f_n\}$ associated with disjoint caps $\{\mathcal{C}_n\} \subset \Gamma$ for which $f = \sum_n f_n$ in the L^2-sense. This decomposition enjoys certain geometric properties which are described in §4. After introducing a suitable metric on the set of all caps, we establish the fact that distant caps interact weakly. Together with the decomposition algorithm, this implies an inequality of geometric nature which is a key step towards gaining control of extremizing sequences.

In §5 we prove that any near extremizer satisfies appropriately scaled upper bounds with respect to some cap, and we use this to obtain a result of *concentration compactness* [**?**] flavor in §6. This result basically states that a nonnegative extremizing sequence behaves in one of two possible ways (up to extraction of a subsequence and up to a small L^2 error): it is either uniformly integrable, or it concentrates at a point. Precompactness can be derived in the former case, since the main obstruction pointed out in [11] is easy to rule out: in fact, L^2 weak limits of nonnegative, uniformly integrable sequences of functions are *nonzero*.

The proof is therefore finished once we show that concentration cannot occur. Aiming at a contradiction, we explore some of the properties that an extremizing sequence which concentrates at a point would have to enjoy. In §7, we compute a certain limiting operator norm exactly, and in particular show that an extremizing sequence which concentrates must do so at a point of minimal curvature. A second ingredient consists in comparing the constant $\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]$ from inequality (2) with the optimal constant for the adjoint Fourier restriction inequality on an appropriately dilated parabola equipped with projection measure, as studied in [13]. We accomplish this in §8, postponing some of the more technical estimates to Appendix 1. We derive the desired contradiction in §9, and that concludes the proof of Theorem 3.

Notation. If x, y are real numbers, we will write $x = O(y)$ or $x \lesssim y$ if there exists a finite constant C such that $|x| \leq C|y|$, and $x \asymp y$ if $C^{-1}|y| \leq |x| \leq C|y|$ for some finite constant $C \neq 0$. If we want to make explicit the dependence of the constant C on some parameter α, we will write $x = O_\alpha(y)$ or $x \lesssim_\alpha y$. As is customary the constant C is allowed to change from line to line. If $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote its λ-dilation by $\lambda \cdot A := \{\lambda x : x \in A\}$. The Minkowski sum of A with itself will be denoted by $A+A = \{x+x' : x \in A \text{ and } x' \in A\}$. Sharp constants will always appear in bold face. By $\Re z$ and $\Im z$ we will denote, respectively, the real and imaginary parts of the complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank his dissertation advisor, Michael Christ, for suggesting the problem, and for many helpful discussions and comments. He would also like to thank René Quilodrán for reading an earlier draft of the paper and for several suggestions on how to improve the exposition.

2. The cap estimate

Let $f, g \in L^2(\sigma)$. We seek to estimate the L^3 norm of the product

$$\widehat{f\sigma} \cdot \widehat{g\sigma}(x,t) = \int_0^\ell \int_0^\ell f(\gamma(s))g(\gamma(s'))e^{-i(x,t)\cdot(\gamma(s)+\gamma(s'))}dsds'. \tag{5}$$

For that purpose, it will be enough to estimate the $L^{3/2}$ norm of the convolution of measures $f\sigma * g\sigma$, which is defined by duality as

$$\langle f\sigma * g\sigma, \varphi\rangle = \int_0^\ell \int_0^\ell f(\gamma(s))g(\gamma(s'))\varphi(\gamma(s)+\gamma(s'))dsds'$$

for any test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Gamma, \sigma)$.

To analyze the integral (5), we make the following change of variables:

$$(s,s') \mapsto (u,v) = (x(s)+x(s'), y(s)+y(s')), \tag{6}$$

Splitting

$$f(\gamma(s))g(\gamma(s')) = f(\gamma(s))g(\gamma(s'))(\chi_{\{s>s'\}} + \chi_{\{s<s'\}}) \text{ for a.e. } (s,s')$$

and using the triangle inequality, we lose no generality in assuming that $s > s'$ in the support of $f(\gamma(s))g(\gamma(s'))$. As a consequence, the transformation (6) is injective in the support of $f(\gamma(s))g(\gamma(s'))$. It follows that

$$\widehat{f\sigma} \cdot \widehat{g\sigma}(x,t) = \iint_{\Gamma+\Gamma} f(\gamma(s(u,v)))g(\gamma(s'(u,v)))e^{-i(x,t)\cdot(u,v)}J^{-1}dudv,$$

where by $J = J(s(u,v), s'(u,v))$ we denote the Jacobian of the transformation (6) on the region $\{s > s'\}$:

$$J(s,s') = \Big|\frac{\partial(u,v)}{\partial(s,s')}\Big| = |x'(s)y'(s') - x'(s')y'(s)| = |\sin(\theta(s)-\theta(s'))|.$$

Note that, for $(u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$f\sigma * g\sigma(u,v) = \begin{cases} f(\gamma(s(u,v)))g(\gamma(s'(u,v)))J^{-1} & \text{if } (u,v) \in \Gamma+\Gamma \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The Hausdorff-Young inequality implies that

$$\|\widehat{f\sigma}\cdot\widehat{g\sigma}\|_3 \le \|f\sigma * g\sigma\|_{3/2} \lesssim \Big(\int_0^\ell \int_0^\ell |f(\gamma(s))|^{3/2}|g(\gamma(s'))|^{3/2}|\sin(\theta(s)-\theta(s'))|^{-1/2}dsds'\Big)^{2/3}. \tag{7}$$

Since Γ has no points with colinear tangents (i.e. condition (1) holds),

$$|\sin(\theta(s)-\theta(s'))| \ge \min\Big\{\frac{2}{\pi}|\theta(s)-\theta(s')|, \delta_0(1+O(\delta_0^2))\Big\}$$

for every $s, s' \in [0,\ell]$. On the other hand, since $\lambda = \min_\Gamma \kappa$,

$$|\theta(s)-\theta(s')| = \Big|\int_{s'}^s \kappa(t)dt\Big| \ge \lambda|s-s'|.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\sigma * g\sigma\|_{3/2}^{3/2} &\lesssim \int_0^\ell \int_0^\ell |f(\gamma(s))|^{3/2} |g(\gamma(s'))|^{3/2} |\sin(\theta(s)-\theta(s'))|^{-1/2} ds ds' \\ &\lesssim_{\lambda,\delta_0} \int_0^\ell \int_0^\ell |f(\gamma(s))|^{3/2} |g(\gamma(s'))|^{3/2} |s-s'|^{-1/2} ds ds'.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the implicit constant blows up as $\lambda \downarrow 0^+$, and this is why we assume that Γ has everywhere positive curvature.

For $0<\alpha<1$, consider the bilinear form:

$$B_\alpha(F,G) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} F(x)G(x')|x-x'|^{-\alpha} dx dx'.$$

The case $\alpha = 1/2$ is related to the preceding discussion. In fact, setting $F := |f\circ\gamma|^{3/2}$ and $G := |g\circ\gamma|^{3/2}$, we already know that

$$\|f\sigma * g\sigma\|_{3/2}^{3/2} \lesssim B_{1/2}(F,G). \tag{8}$$

For $0<\alpha<1$ and $p = 2/(2-\alpha)$, the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality implies that $|B_\alpha(F,F)| \lesssim_p \|F\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2$. In particular, estimate (8) combines with the $L^{4/3}$ bound for $B_{1/2}$ to yield the Tomas-Stein inequality (2):

$$\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6 = \|(\widehat{f\sigma})^2\|_3^{1/2} \lesssim \|f\sigma * f\sigma\|_{3/2}^{1/2} \lesssim B_{1/2}(F,F)^{1/3} \lesssim \|F\|_{4/3}^{2/3} = \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}.$$

Following previous work from [18] and [17], Quilodrán proved in [21, Proposition 4.5] that, for the same range of α and value of p, there exists a constant $\beta>0$ such that

$$|B_\alpha(F,F)| \lesssim \|F\|_p^{2-\beta} \sup_I \Big(|I|^{-1+1/p} \int_I |F|\Big)^\beta \tag{9}$$

for every $F \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$. Here the supremum ranges over all compact intervals I of $\mathbb{R}$. If instead of the $L^{4/3}$ bound for $B_{1/2}$ we use the more refined estimate (9), then reasoning in a similar way as before leads to the following improved estimate:

Proposition 4. (Cap estimate) *There exists $C<\infty$ and $\beta>0$ such that for every $f \in L^2(\sigma)$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)} \le C\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^{1-\beta/2} \sup_{\mathcal{C}\subset\Gamma} \Big(|\mathcal{C}|^{-1/4} \int_{\mathcal{C}} |f|^{3/2} d\sigma\Big)^{\beta/3}. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Set, as before, $F(s) := |f(\gamma(s))|^{3/2}$. Then (8) and (9) imply:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6 \lesssim \|f\sigma * f\sigma\|_{3/2}^{1/2} \lesssim B_{1/2}(F,F)^{1/3} &\lesssim \|F\|_{4/3}^{2/3-\beta/3} \sup_I \Big(|I|^{-1/4} \int_I |F(s)| ds\Big)^{\beta/3} \\ &= \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^{1-\beta/2} \sup_{\mathcal{C}} \Big(|\mathcal{C}|^{-1/4} \int_{\mathcal{C}} |f|^{3/2} d\sigma\Big)^{\beta/3},\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

3. The decomposition algorithm

The cap estimate (10) is the only ingredient we need to prove the analog of [7, Lemma 2.6], which establishes a weak connection between functions satisfying modest lower bounds $\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6 \gtrsim \delta\|f\|_2$ and characteristic functions of caps:

Lemma 5. *For any $\delta > 0$ there exist $C_\delta < \infty$ and $\eta_\delta > 0$ with the following property: if $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ satisfies $\|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6 \geq \delta\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}$, then there exists a decomposition $f = g + h$ and a cap $\mathcal{C} \subset \Gamma$ satisfying*

$$0 \leq |g|, |h| \leq |f|, \tag{11}$$

$$g, h \textit{ have disjoint supports}, \tag{12}$$

$$|g(\gamma(s))| \leq C_\delta\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}|\mathcal{C}|^{-1/2}\chi_{\mathcal{C}}(\gamma(s)), \textit{ for all } s \in [0, \ell], \tag{13}$$

$$\|g\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \geq \eta_\delta\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}. \tag{14}$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the one of [7, Lemma 2.6] but we reproduce it here for the convenience of the reader. We can, without loss of generality, normalize so that $\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} = 1$. By Proposition 4 there exists a cap $\mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} |f|^{3/2} d\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} c(\delta)|\mathcal{C}|^{1/4}.$$

Here $c(\delta) = c_0 \cdot \delta^{3/\beta}$ for some absolute constant $c_0 > 0$ whose exact value is not important for the analysis. Let $R \geq 1$, and define $E := \{\gamma(s) \in \mathcal{C} : |f(\gamma(s))| \leq R\}$. Set $g = f\chi_E$ and $h = f - f\chi_E$. Then g and h have disjoint supports, $g + h = f$, g is supported on $\mathcal{C}$, and $\|g\|_\infty \leq R$. Since $|h(\gamma(s))| \geq R$ for almost every $\gamma(s) \in \mathcal{C}$ for which $h(\gamma(s)) \neq 0$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} |h|^{3/2} d\sigma \leq R^{-1/2} \int_{\mathcal{C}} |h|^2 d\sigma \leq R^{-1/2}\|f\|_2^2 = R^{-1/2}.$$

Define R by $R^{-1/2} = \frac{1}{4}c(\delta)|\mathcal{C}|^{1/4}$. Then

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} |g|^{3/2} d\sigma = \int_{\mathcal{C}} |f|^{3/2} d\sigma - \int_{\mathcal{C}} |h|^{3/2} d\sigma \geq \frac{1}{4} c(\delta)|\mathcal{C}|^{1/4}.$$

By Hölder's inequality, since g is supported on $\mathcal{C}$,

$$\|g\|_2 \geq |\mathcal{C}|^{-1/6}\Big(\int_{\mathcal{C}} |g|^{3/2} d\sigma\Big)^{2/3} \geq c'(\delta) = c'(\delta)\|f\|_2 > 0. \qquad \square$$

Conditions 13 and 14 easily imply a lower bound on the L^1 norm of g:

Lemma 6. *Let $g \in L^2(\sigma)$ satisfy $|g(x)| \leq a|\mathcal{C}|^{-1/2}\chi_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$ and $\|g\|_2 \geq b$ for some $a, b > 0$ and $\mathcal{C} \subset \Gamma$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(a, b) > 0$ such that*

$$\|g\|_{L^1(\sigma)} \geq C|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Estimate:

$$\|g\|_{L^1(\sigma)} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} |g| d\sigma \geq a^{-1}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}\|g\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)} \geq a^{-1}b^2|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}. \qquad \square$$

In what follows we will restrict our attention to *nonnegative* functions.[2] Indeed, by Plancherel's theorem, inequality (2) is equivalent to

$$\|f\sigma * f\sigma * f\sigma\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \frac{\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3}{2\pi}\|f\|^3_{L^2(\sigma)}. \tag{15}$$

The pointwise inequality $|f\sigma * f\sigma * f\sigma| \leq |f|\sigma * |f|\sigma * |f|\sigma$ then implies that, if f is an extremizer for inequality (2), so if $|f|$; similarly, if $\{f_n\}$ is an extremizing sequence, so is $\{|f_n|\}$.

A decomposition algorithm analogous to the one from [7, Step 6A] may be applied to any given nonnegative $f \in L^2(\sigma)$. We describe it precisely:

Decomposition algorithm. Initialize by setting $G_0 = f$ and $\epsilon_0 = 1/2$.

Step n: The inputs for step n are a nonnegative function $G_n \in L^2(\sigma)$ and a positive number ϵ_n. Its outputs are functions f_n, G_{n+1} and nonnegative numbers $\epsilon_n^\star, \epsilon_{n+1}$.

If $\|G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma\|_2 = 0$, then $G_n = 0$ almost everywhere. The algorithm then terminates, and we define $\epsilon_n^\star = 0$, $f_n = 0$, and $G_m = f_m = 0$, $\epsilon_m = 0$ for all $m > n$.

If $0 < \|G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma\|_2 < \epsilon_n^3(2\pi)^{-1}\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3\|f\|_2^3$, then replace ϵ_n by $\epsilon_n/2$; repeat until the first time that $\|G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma\|_2 \geq \epsilon_n^3(2\pi)^{-1}\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3\|f\|_2^3$. Define $\epsilon_n^\star$ to be this value of ϵ_n. Then

$$(\epsilon_n^\star)^3\frac{\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3}{2\pi}\|f\|_2^3 \leq \|G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma\|_2 \leq 8(\epsilon_n^\star)^3\frac{\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3}{2\pi}\|f\|_2^3. \tag{16}$$

Apply Lemma 5 to obtain a cap $\mathcal{C}_n$ and a decomposition $G_n = f_n + G_{n+1}$ with disjointly supported nonnegative summands satisfying $f_n \leq C_n\|f\|_2|\mathcal{C}_n|^{-1/2}\chi_{\mathcal{C}_n}$ and $\|f_n\|_2 \geq \eta_n\|f\|_2$. Here, C_n, η_n are bounded above and below, respectively, by quantities which depend only on $\|G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma\|_2^{1/3}/\|G_n\|_2 \gtrsim \epsilon_n^\star$. Define $\epsilon_{n+1} = \epsilon_n^\star$, and move on to step $n+1$. $\square$

The following exact analogs of [7, Lemmas 8.1, 8.3, 8.4] hold:

Lemma 7. *Let $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ be a nonnegative function with positive norm. If the decomposition algorithm never terminates for f, then $\epsilon_n^\star \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and $\sum_{n=0}^N f_n \to f$ in $L^2(\sigma)$ as $N \to \infty$.*

The proof of Lemma 7 is identical to the corresponding one in [7] and therefore is omitted.

This decomposition is in general very inefficient. However, if f nearly extremizes inequality (2), then more useful properties hold. Before we turn into these, let us recall a useful fact about near extremizers which already appeared in [20, Lemma 9.2]:

---

[2] For much of the analysis this makes no difference, but nonnegativity will play a crucial role in §6 when we establish precompactness of uniformly integrable extremizing sequences; see the proof of Lemma 23.

Lemma 8. *Let* $f = g + h \in L^2(\sigma)$*. Suppose that* $g \perp h$*,* $g \neq 0$*, and that* f *is* δ*-near extremizer for some* $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$*. Then*

$$\frac{\|h\|_2}{\|f\|_2} \leq C \max\Big(\frac{\|\widehat{h\sigma}\|_6}{\|h\|_2}, \delta^{1/2}\Big). \tag{17}$$

Here $C < \infty$ *is a constant independent of* g *and* h*.*

The proof is almost identical to that of [7, Lemma 7.1] but we reproduce it here for the convenience of the reader.

Proof. The inequality is invariant under multiplication of f by a positive constant, so we may assume without loss of generality that $\|g\|_2 = 1$. We may assume that $\|h\|_2 > 0$, since otherwise the conclusion is trivial. Define $y = \|h\|_2$ and

$$\eta = \frac{\|\widehat{h\sigma}\|_6}{\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]\|h\|_2}.$$

If $\eta > \frac{1}{2}$ then (17) holds trivially with $C = 2/\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]$, for the left-hand side cannot exceed 1 since $f = g + h$ with $g \perp h$.

We also have that

$$(1-\delta)\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]\|f\|_2 \leq \|\widehat{f\sigma}\|_6 \leq \|\widehat{g\sigma}\|_6 + \|\widehat{h\sigma}\|_6 \leq \mathbf{C}[\Gamma](1 + \eta y).$$

Since $g \perp h$, $\|f\|_2^2 = 1 + y^2$ and therefore

$$(1-\delta)(1+y^2)^{1/2} \leq 1 + \eta y.$$

Squaring gives

$$(1-2\delta)(1+y^2) \leq 1 + 2\eta y + \eta^2 y^2.$$

Since $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ and $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\frac{1}{2}y^2 \leq 2\delta + 2\eta y + \eta^2 y^2 \leq 2\delta + 2\eta y + \frac{1}{4}y^2$$

whence either $y^2 \leq 16\delta$ or $y \leq 16\eta$.

Substituting the definitions of y, η, and majorizing $\|h\|_2/\|f\|_2$ by $\|h\|_2/\|g\|_2$, yields the stated conclusion. □

Regardless of whether the decomposition algorithm terminates for f, the norms of f_n, G_n enjoy upper bounds independent of f, for all but very large n:

Lemma 9. *There exist a sequence of positive constants* $\gamma_n \to 0$ *and a function* $N : (0, \frac{1}{2}] \to \mathbb{N}$ *satisfying* $N(\delta) \to \infty$ *as* $\delta \to 0$ *with the following property: for any nonnegative* δ*-near extremizer* $f \in L^2(\sigma)$*, the quantities* $\epsilon_n^\star$ *and the functions* f_n, G_n *obtained when the decomposition algorithm is applied to* f *satisfy*

$$\epsilon_n^\star \leq \gamma_n \text{ for all } n \leq N(\delta), \tag{18}$$

$$\|G_n\|_2 \leq \gamma_n \|f\|_2 \text{ for all } n \leq N(\delta), \text{ and} \tag{19}$$

$$\|f_n\|_2 \leq \gamma_n \|f\|_2 \text{ for all } n \leq N(\delta). \tag{20}$$

Proof. By (15) and (16),

$$\frac{\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3}{2\pi}\|G_n\|_2^3 \geq \|G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma * G_n\sigma\|_2 \geq (\epsilon_n^\star)^3\frac{\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3}{2\pi}\|f\|_2^3 = \Big(\frac{(\epsilon_n^\star)^3\|f\|_2^3}{\|G_n\|_2^3}\Big)\cdot\frac{\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3}{2\pi}\|G_n\|_2^3,$$

so $\epsilon_n^\star \leq \|G_n\|_2/\|f\|_2$. Thus the second conclusion implies the first. Since $\|f_n\|_2 \leq \|G_n\|_2$, it also implies the third.

We recall two facts. Firstly, Lemma 8 applied to $h = G_n$ and $g = f_0 + \ldots + f_{n-1}$ asserts that there are constants $c_0, C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that whenever $f \in L^2$ is a δ-near extremizer, either $\|\widehat{G_n\sigma}\|_6 \geq c_0\|G_n\|_2^2\|f\|_2^{-1}$, or $\|G_n\|_2 \leq C_1\delta^{1/2}\|f\|_2$. Secondly, according to Lemma 5, there exists a nondecreasing function $\rho : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ satisfying $\rho(t) \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ such that for every nonzero $f \in L^2$ and any n, if $\|\widehat{G_n\sigma}\|_6 \geq t\|G_n\|_2$, then $\|f_n\|_2 \geq \rho(t)\|G_n\|_2$.

Choose a sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ of positive numbers which tends monotonically to zero, but does so sufficiently slowly to satisfy

$$(n+1)\gamma_n\rho(c_0\gamma_n) > 1 \text{ for all } n.$$

Define $N(\delta)$ to be the largest integer satisfying

$$\gamma_{N(\delta)} \geq C_1\delta^{1/2}.$$

Note that $N(\delta) \to \infty$ as $\delta \to 0$ because $\gamma_n > 0$ for all n.

Let f, δ be given. Suppose that $n \leq N(\delta)$. Aiming at a contradiction, suppose that $\|G_n\|_2 > \gamma_n\|f\|_2$. Then by definition of $N(\delta)$, $\|G_n\|_2 > C_1\delta^{1/2}\|f\|_2$. By the above dichotomy,

$$\|\widehat{G_n\sigma}\|_6 \geq c_0\|G_n\|_2^2\|f\|_2^{-1} \geq c_0\gamma_n\|G_n\|_2.$$

By the second fact reviewed above,

$$\|f_n\|_2 \geq \rho(c_0\gamma_n)\|G_n\|_2 \geq \gamma_n\rho(c_0\gamma_n)\|f\|_2.$$

Since $\|G_m\|_2 \geq \|G_n\|_2$ for every $m \leq n$, the same lower bound follows for $\|f_m\|_2$ for every $m \leq n$. Since the functions f_m are pairwise orthogonal, $\sum_{m\leq n}\|f_m\|_2^2 \leq \|f\|_2^2$, and consequently $(n+1)\gamma_n\rho(c_0\gamma_n) \leq 1$, a contradiction. □

The following lemma is a direct consequence of the decomposition algorithm coupled with Lemma 5:

Lemma 10. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $\delta_\epsilon > 0$ and $C_\epsilon < \infty$ such that, if $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ is a nonnegative δ_ϵ-near extremizer, then the functions f_n, G_n associated to f by the decomposition algorithm satisfy, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

(i) *If $\|G_n\|_2 \geq \epsilon\|f\|_2$ then there exists a cap $\mathcal{C}_n \subset \Gamma$ such that*

$$f_n \leq C_\epsilon\|f\|_2|\mathcal{C}_n|^{-1/2}\chi_{\mathcal{C}_n}.$$

(ii) *If $\|G_n\|_2 \geq \epsilon\|f\|_2$, then $\|f_n\|_2 \geq \delta_\epsilon\|f\|_2$.*

4. A geometric property of the decomposition

Consider two caps $\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}'\subset\Gamma$, and assume without loss of generality that $|\mathcal{C}'|\leq|\mathcal{C}|$. Let $f,g\in L^2(\sigma)$ be such that $\operatorname{supp}(f)\subset\mathcal{C}$ and $\operatorname{supp}(g)\subset\mathcal{C}'$. The following estimate is a direct consequence of (7) and Hölder's inequality :

$$\|f\sigma*g\sigma\|_{3/2}\lesssim\Big(\frac{\inf_{s,s'}|\sin(\theta(s)-\theta(s'))|}{|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}}\Big)^{-1/3}\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\sigma)}. \tag{21}$$

We can rewrite this estimate in the following way: letting $\ell(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}'):=\inf_{s\in\mathcal{C},s'\in\mathcal{C}'}|s-s'|$, then (8) and Hölder's inequality imply

$$\|f\sigma*g\sigma\|_{3/2}\lesssim\Big(\frac{\ell(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}')}{|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}}\Big)^{-1/3}\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\sigma)}. \tag{22}$$

For characteristic functions of caps we have the following additional estimate:

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}'\subset\Gamma$ be caps. Then:*

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}\lesssim\Big(\frac{|\mathcal{C}'|}{|\mathcal{C}|}\Big)^{1/12}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we might assume that $10|\mathcal{C}'|\leq|\mathcal{C}|$, otherwise estimate (23) is just a consequence of the fundamental inequality

$$\|f\sigma*g\sigma\|_{3/2}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\|g\|_{L^2(\sigma)}. \tag{24}$$

Let $\mathcal{C}^*$ be a cap neighborhood of $\mathcal{C}'$ with the same center and of size $|\mathcal{C}^*|=|\mathcal{C}|^{3/4}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/4}$. Split $\chi_{\mathcal{C}}=\chi_{\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{C}^*}+\chi_{\mathcal{C}\setminus\mathcal{C}^*}$. Then

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2}\leq\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{C}^*}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2}+\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}\setminus\mathcal{C}^*}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2}.$$

The first summand can be easily estimated using (24). While $\mathcal{C}\setminus\mathcal{C}^*$ is not necessarily a cap, it is the union of at most two caps, say, $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$. We can use estimate (22) to control the contribution of each of these caps. Noting that

$$\min\{\ell(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}'),\ell(\mathcal{C}_2,\mathcal{C}')\}\geq\ell(\mathcal{C}\setminus\mathcal{C}^*,\mathcal{C}')\gtrsim|\mathcal{C}^*|,$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2}&\lesssim\Big(|\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{C}^*|^{1/2}+\Big(\frac{\ell(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}')}{|\mathcal{C}_1|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}}\Big)^{-1/3}|\mathcal{C}_1|^{1/2}+\Big(\frac{\ell(\mathcal{C}_2,\mathcal{C}')}{|\mathcal{C}_2|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}}\Big)^{-1/3}|\mathcal{C}_2|^{1/2}\Big)|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}\\&\lesssim\Big(|\mathcal{C}^*|^{1/2}+\Big(\frac{|\mathcal{C}^*|}{|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}}\Big)^{-1/3}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}\Big)|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}\\&\lesssim\Big(\frac{|\mathcal{C}'|}{|\mathcal{C}|}\Big)^{1/12}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

The set of all caps can be made into a metric space. We define the distance d from $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, r)$ to $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}(s', r')$ to be the hyperbolic distance from (s, r) to (s', r') in the upper half plane model. More explicitly, we have that

$$d(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') := \operatorname{arc\,cosh}\Big(1 + \frac{(s-s')^2 + (r-r')^2}{2rr'}\Big). \tag{25}$$

If $s = s'$, then the distance depends only on the ratio of the two radii. When $r = r'$, the distance is $\asymp r^{-1}|s - s'|$ and so this distance has the natural scaling.

We can use estimates (22) and (23) to prove that the quantity $\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2}$ is much smaller than the trivial bound $|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}$ unless $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'$ have comparable radii and nearby centers:

Lemma 12. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\rho < \infty$ such that*

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} < \epsilon|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}$$

whenever

$$d(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') > \rho.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, r)$ and $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}'(s', r')$. As before, assume $r' \leq r$. We consider three cases.

Start by assuming that $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ have comparable radii: say, $\frac{1}{10}r \leq r' \leq r$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ are not far apart unless the corresponding centers are far apart. We may therefore assume that $|s - s'| \geq 10r$, which in turn implies $\ell(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') \gtrsim |s - s'|$. Using estimate (22), we conclude that

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2} \lesssim \Big(\frac{|s-s'|}{r}\Big)^{-1/3}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2} \lesssim (\cosh\rho)^{-1/6}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}$$

provided $d(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') > \rho$.

Assume now that $10r' < r$. If $|s - s'| < 10r$, then we can use Lemma 11 to conclude

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2} \lesssim \Big(\frac{r'}{r}\Big)^{1/12}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}.$$

This quantity is $\lesssim (\cosh\rho)^{-1/12}|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}$ provided $d(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') > \rho$, and this concludes the analysis in this case. If on the other hand $|s - s'| \geq 10r$, then $d(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') > \rho$ implies

$$\frac{(s-s')^2}{rr'} \gtrsim \cosh\rho \;\text{ or }\; \frac{r}{r'} \gtrsim \cosh\rho.$$

Using, as before, estimate (22) in the former case and Lemma 11 in the latter, we arrive at the desired conclusion. ☐

For applications later on, we will need a trilinear version of this lemma which follows immediately from the previous result:

Corollary 13. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\rho < \infty$ such that*

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}''}\sigma\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} < \epsilon|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}''|^{1/2}$$

whenever

$$\max\{d(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}'),d(\mathcal{C}',\mathcal{C}''),d(\mathcal{C}'',\mathcal{C})\}>\rho.$$

Proof. Using Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}''}\sigma\|_2\leq\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_2^{1/2}\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}''}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}''}\sigma\|_2^{1/2}. \tag{26}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that the caps $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ are far apart: in view of Lemma 12, we can choose $\rho<\infty$ so that $d(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}')>\rho$ implies $\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2}<\epsilon^2|\mathcal{C}|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}$. Bound the first factor appearing in (26) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_2&\simeq\|\widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma}\cdot\widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma}\cdot\widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma}\|_2\leq\|\widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma}\|_6\|\widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma}\cdot\widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma}\|_3\\&\leq\|\widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma}\|_6\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma\|_{3/2}<\epsilon^2|\mathcal{C}||\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

The proof is then complete in view of the trivial estimate $\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}'}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}''}\sigma*\chi_{\mathcal{C}''}\sigma\|_2\leq|\mathcal{C}'|^{1/2}|\mathcal{C}''|$. □

Corollary 13 allows us to establish the following additional inequality of geometric nature, which can be proved in an identical way to [20, Lemma 2.38].

Lemma 14. *For any $\epsilon>0$ there exist $\delta>0$ and $\lambda<\infty$ such that for any nonnegative $f\in L^2(\sigma)$ which is δ-near extremizer, the summands f_n produced by the decomposition algorithm and the associated caps $\mathcal{C}_n$ satisfy*

$$d(\mathcal{C}_j,\mathcal{C}_k)\leq\lambda\text{ whenever }\|f_j\|_2\geq\epsilon\|f\|_2\text{ and }\|f_k\|_2\geq\epsilon\|f\|_2.$$

We provide one proof which follows the proof of [7, Lemma 9.2] more closely:

Proof. It suffices to prove this for all sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$. Let f be a nonnegative L^2 function which satisfies $\|f\|_2=1$ and is δ-near extremizer for a sufficiently small $\delta=\delta(\epsilon)$, and let $\{f_n,G_n\}$ be associated to f via the decomposition algorithm. Set $F=\sum_{n=0}^N f_n$.

Suppose that $\|f_{j_0}\|_2\geq\epsilon$ and $\|f_{k_0}\|_2\geq\epsilon$. Let N be the smallest integer such that $\|G_{N+1}\|_2<\epsilon^3$. Since $\|G_n\|_2$ is a nonincreasing function of n, and since $\|f_n\|_2\leq\|G_n\|_2$, necessarily $j_0,k_0\leq N$. Moreover, by Lemma 9, there exists $M_\epsilon<\infty$ depending *only* on ϵ such that $N\leq M_\epsilon$. By Lemma 10, if δ is chosen to be a sufficiently small function of ϵ then since $\|G_n\|_2\geq\epsilon^3$ for all $n\leq N$, $f_n\leq\theta(\epsilon)|\mathcal{C}_n|^{-1/2}\chi_{\mathcal{C}_n}$ for all such n, where θ is a continuous, strictly positive function on $(0,1]$.

Now let $\lambda<\infty$ be a large quantity to be specified. It suffices to show that if $\delta(\epsilon)$ is sufficiently small, an assumption that $d(\mathcal{C}_j,\mathcal{C}_k)>\lambda$ implies an upper bound, which depends only on ϵ, for λ.

As proved in [7, Lemma 9.1], there exists a decomposition $F=F_1+F_2=\sum_{n\in S_1}f_n+\sum_{n\in S_2}f_n$ where $[0,N]=S_1\cup S_2$ is a partition of $[0,N]$, $j_0\in S_1$, $k_0\in S_2$, and $d(\mathcal{C}_j,\mathcal{C}_k)\geq\lambda/2N\geq\lambda/2M_\epsilon$ for all $j\in S_1$ and $k\in S_2$. Certainly $\|F_1\|_2\geq\|f_{j_0}\|_2\geq\epsilon$, and similarly $\|F_2\|_2\geq\epsilon$. One of the cross term satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\|F_1\sigma * F_1\sigma * F_2\sigma\|_2 &\leq \sum_{i\in S_1}\sum_{j\in S_1}\sum_{k\in S_2}\|f_i\sigma * f_j\sigma * f_k\sigma\|_2\\ &\leq \theta(\epsilon)^3\sum_{i\in S_1}\sum_{j\in S_1}\sum_{k\in S_2}|\mathcal{C}_i|^{-1/2}|\mathcal{C}_j|^{-1/2}|\mathcal{C}_k|^{-1/2}\|\chi_{\mathcal{C}_i}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}_j}\sigma * \chi_{\mathcal{C}_k}\sigma\|_2\\ &\leq M_\epsilon^3\gamma(\lambda/2M_\epsilon)\theta(\epsilon)^3\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma(\lambda)\to 0$ as $\lambda\to\infty$ by Corollary 13. The other cross term $F_1\sigma * F_2\sigma * F_2\sigma$ can be estimated in an identical way. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|F\sigma * F\sigma * F\sigma\|_2 &\leq \|F_1\sigma * F_1\sigma * F_1\sigma\|_2 + \|F_2\sigma * F_2\sigma * F_2\sigma\|_2 + 3\|F_1\sigma * F_1\sigma * F_2\sigma\|_2 +\\ &+ 3\|F_1\sigma * F_2\sigma * F_2\sigma\|_2\\ &\leq (2\pi)^{-1}\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3(\|F_1\|_2^3 + \|F_2\|_2^3) + 6M_\epsilon^3\gamma(\lambda/2M_\epsilon)\theta(\epsilon)^3.\end{aligned}$$

Since F_1 and F_2 have disjoint supports, $\|F_1\|_2^2 + \|F_2\|_2^2 \leq \|f\|_2^2 = 1$ and consequently

$$\|F_1\|_2^3 + \|F_2\|_2^3 \leq \max(\|F_1\|_2, \|F_2\|_2)\cdot(\|F_1\|_2^2 + \|F_2\|_2^2) \leq (1-\epsilon^2)^{1/2}\cdot 1 \leq (1-\epsilon^2)^{1/2}.$$

Thus

$$\|F\sigma * F\sigma * F\sigma\|_2 \leq (2\pi)^{-1}\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3(1-\epsilon^2)^{1/2} + 6M_\epsilon^3\gamma(\lambda/2M_\epsilon)\theta(\epsilon)^3.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}(2\pi)^{-1}\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3(1-\delta)^3 \leq \|f\sigma * f\sigma * f\sigma\|_2 &\leq \|F\sigma * F\sigma * F\sigma\|_2 + C\|F\|_2^2\|G_{N+1}\|_2\\ &\leq \|F\sigma * F\sigma * F\sigma\|_2 + C\epsilon^3,\end{aligned}$$

by transitivity we have that

$$(2\pi)^{-1}\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3(1-\delta)^3 \leq C\epsilon^3 + (2\pi)^{-1}\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]^3(1-\epsilon^2)^{1/2} + 6M_\epsilon^3\gamma(\lambda/2M_\epsilon)\theta(\epsilon)^3.$$

Since $\gamma(t)\to 0$ as $t\to\infty$, this implies, for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, an upper bound for λ which depends only on ϵ, as was to be proved. □

5. Upper bounds for extremizing sequences

The decomposition algorithm and Lemma 14 allow us to prove that any near extremizer satisfies appropriate scaled upper bounds with respect to some cap. First we need a definition:

Definition 15. *Let* $\Theta : [1,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ *satisfy* $\Theta(R) \to 0$ *as* $R\to\infty$*. A function* $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ *is said to be* upper normalized *(with gauge function* Θ*) with respect to a cap*

$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\gamma(s_0), r_0) \subset \Gamma$ *of radius* r_0 *and center* $\gamma(s_0)$ *if*

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \le C < \infty, \tag{27}$$

$$\int_{\{s:|f(\gamma(s))| \ge Rr_0^{-1/2}\}} |f(\gamma(s))|^2 ds \le \Theta(R), \ \ \forall R \ge 1, \tag{28}$$

$$\int_{\{s:|s-s_0| \ge Rr_0\}} |f(\gamma(s))|^2 ds \le \Theta(R), \ \ \forall R \ge 1. \tag{29}$$

Proposition 16. *There exists a function* $\Theta : [1, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ *satisfying* $\Theta(R) \to 0$ *as* $R \to \infty$ *with the following property. For every* $\epsilon > 0$*, there exist a cap* $\mathcal{C} \subset \Gamma$ *and a threshold* $\delta > 0$ *such that any nonnegative* $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ *which is a* δ*-near extremizer with* $\|f\|_2 = 1$ *may be decomposed as* $f = F + G$*, where:*

$$G, F \ge 0 \text{ have disjoint supports}, \tag{30}$$

$$\|G\|_2 < \epsilon, \tag{31}$$

$$F \text{ is upper normalized with respect to } \mathcal{C}. \tag{32}$$

Proposition 16 is actually equivalent to the following superficially weaker statement:

Lemma 17. *There exists a function* $\Theta : [1, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ *satisfying* $\Theta(R) \to 0$ *as* $R \to \infty$ *with the following property. For every* $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $\bar{R} \ge 1$*, there exist a cap* $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s_0, r_0)$ *and a threshold* $\delta > 0$ *such that any nonnegative* $f \in L^2(\sigma)$ *which is a* δ*-near extremizer with* $\|f\|_2 = 1$ *may be decomposed as* $f = F + G$*, where:*

$$G, F \ge 0 \text{ have disjoint supports}, \tag{33}$$

$$\|G\|_2 < \epsilon, \tag{34}$$

$$\int_{\{s:F(\gamma(s)) \ge Rr_0^{-1/2}\}} F(\gamma(s))^2 ds, \int_{\{s:|s-s_0| \ge Rr_0\}} F(\gamma(s))^2 ds \le \Theta(R), \ \ \forall R \in [1, \bar{R}]. \tag{35}$$

Proof that Lemma 17 implies Proposition 16 is the exactly the same as in [7, p. 26] and so we do not include it here.

Proof of Lemma 17. Let $\eta : [1, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ be a function to be chosen below, satisfying $\eta(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. This function will not depend on the quantity $\bar{R}$.

Let $\bar{R} \ge 1$, $R \in [1, \bar{R}]$, and $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Let $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, \bar{R}) > 0$ be a small quantity to be chosen below. Let $0 \le f \in L^2(\sigma)$ be δ-near extremizer, with $\|f\|_2 = 1$.

Let $\{f_n\}$ be the sequence of functions obtained by applying the decomposition algorithm to f. Choose $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0$ sufficiently small and $M = M(\epsilon)$ sufficiently large to guarantee that $\|G_{M+1}\|_2 < \epsilon/2$ and that f_n, G_n satisfy all the conclusions of Lemma 10 and Lemma 9 for $n \le M$. Set $F = \sum_{n=0}^{M} f_n$. Then $\|f - F\|_2 = \|G_{M+1}\|_2 < \epsilon/2$.

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be the minimum of M, and the smallest number such that $\|f_{N+1}\|_2 < \eta$. N is majorized by a quantity which depends only on η. Set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_N = \sum_{k=0}^{N} f_k$. It follows from part (ii) of Lemma 10 that

$$\|F - \mathcal{F}\|_2 \le \|G_{N+1}\|_2 < \zeta(\eta) \text{ where } \zeta(\eta) \to 0 \text{ as } \eta \to 0. \tag{36}$$

This function ζ is independent of ϵ and $\bar{R}$.

To prove the lemma, we must produce an appropriate cap $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s_0, r_0)$, and must establish the existence of Θ. To do the former is simple: to f_0 is associated a cap $\mathcal{C}_0$ such that $f_0 \leq C|\mathcal{C}_0|^{-1/2}\chi_{\mathcal{C}_0}$. Then $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_0$ is the required cap. Note that, by Lemma 6, $\|f_0\|_1 \geq c$ for some positive universal constant c.

Suppose that functions $R \mapsto \eta(R)$ and $R \mapsto \Theta(R)$ are chosen so that

$$\eta(R) \to 0 \text{ as } R \to \infty \tag{37}$$

$$\zeta(\eta(R))^2 \leq \Theta(R) \text{ for all } R. \tag{38}$$

Then, by (36), $F - \mathcal{F}$ already satisfies the desired inequalities in $L^2(\sigma)$, so it suffices to show that $\mathcal{F}(\gamma(s)) \equiv 0$ whenever $|s - s_0| \geq Rr_0$, and that $\|\mathcal{F}\|_\infty < Rr_0^{-1/2}$.

Each summand of $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $f_k \leq C(\eta)|\mathcal{C}_k|^{-1/2}\chi_{\mathcal{C}_k}$ where $C(\eta) < \infty$ depends only on η, and in particular, f_k is supported in $\mathcal{C}_k$. $\|f_k\|_2 \geq \eta$ for all $k \leq N$, by definition of N. Therefore by Lemma 14, there exists a function $\eta \mapsto \lambda(\eta) < \infty$, such that if δ is sufficiently small as a function of η then $d(\mathcal{C}_k, \mathcal{C}_0) \leq \lambda(\eta)$ for every $k \leq N$. This is needed for $\eta = \eta(R)$ for all R in the compact set $[1, \bar{R}]$, so such a δ may be chosen as a function of $\bar{R}$ alone; conditions already imposed on δ above make it a function of both ϵ and $\bar{R}$.

In the region of all $\gamma(s) \in \Gamma$ such that $|s - s_0| \geq Rr_0$, either $f_k \equiv 0$, or $\mathcal{C}_k$ has radius $\geq \frac{1}{2}Rr_0$, or the center $\gamma(s_k)$ of $\mathcal{C}_k$ is such that $|s_k - s_0| \geq \frac{1}{2}Rr_0$. Choose a function $R \mapsto \eta(R)$ which tends to 0 sufficiently slowly that the latter two cases would contradict the inequality $d(\mathcal{C}_k, \mathcal{C}_0) \leq \lambda$, and therefore cannot arise. Then $\mathcal{F}(\gamma(s)) \equiv 0$ when $|s - s_0| \geq Rr_0$.

With the function η specified, Θ can be defined by $\Theta(R) := \zeta(\eta(R))^2$. Then

$$\int_{\{s:|s-s_0|\geq Rr_0\}} F(\gamma(s))^2 ds \leq \Theta(R), \quad \forall R \in [1, \bar{R}]. \tag{39}$$

We claim next that $\|\mathcal{F}\|_\infty < Rr_0^{-1/2}$ if R is sufficiently large as a function of η. Indeed, because the summands f_k have pairwise disjoint supports, it suffices to control $\max_{k\leq N} \|f_k\|_\infty$. Again by Lemma 10, $\|f_k\|_\infty \leq C(\eta)|\mathcal{C}_k|^{-1/2}$. If $\eta(R)$ is chosen to tend to zero sufficiently slowly as $R \to \infty$ to ensure that $2C(\eta(R)) \cosh \lambda(\eta(R)) < R$ for all $k \leq N$, then

$$\|f_k\|_\infty < R(2 \cosh \lambda(\eta(R)))^{-1} r_k^{-1/2} \leq Rr_0^{-1/2}$$

since $d(\mathcal{C}_k, \mathcal{C}_0) \leq \lambda(\eta(R))$. It follows that

$$\int_{\{s:F(\gamma(s))\geq Rr_0^{-1/2}\}} F(\gamma(s))^2 ds \leq \Theta(R), \quad \forall R \in [1, \bar{R}], \tag{40}$$

provided that Θ is defined as above.

The final function η must be chosen to tend to zero slowly enough to satisfy the requirements of the proofs of both (39) and (40). $\square$

6. A CONCENTRATION COMPACTNESS RESULT

Let us start by making precise the previously mentioned notions of *uniform integrability* and *concentration at a point.*

Definition 18. *Let* $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ *be a measure space and let* $p \in [1, \infty)$*. A subset* $\mathcal{U}$ *of* $L^p(X)$ *is called* uniformly integrable *of order* p *if for every* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists* $\delta > 0$ *such that for every measurable subset* A *of* X *for which* $\mu(A) < \delta$*,*

$$\int_A |f|^p d\mu < \epsilon, \quad \textit{for every } f \in \mathcal{U}.$$

If $\mathcal{U}$ is a bounded subset of $L^p(X)$, it is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{U}$ is uniformly integrable of order p if and only if

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \int_{\{|f|>R\}} |f|^p d\mu = 0$$

uniformly with respect to $f \in \mathcal{U}$.

If the measure space is finite, then it is well-known that uniform integrability coupled with a weaker form of convergence is enough to ensure strong convergence:

Proposition 19. *Suppose* $\mu(X) < \infty$*, and let* $p \in [1, \infty)$*. Let* $\{f_n\}$ *be a sequence in* $L^p(X)$ *and let* $f \in L^p(X)$*. The sequence* $\{f_n\}$ *converges to* f *in* L^p *if (and only if) the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *The sequence* $\{f_n\}$ *converges in measure to* f*;*
(ii) *The family* $\{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *is uniformly integrable of order* p*.*

Proof. We prove only the direction that will be of use to us (the *if* part). The assumptions, together with the fact that any family consisting of one single function is automatically uniformly integrable, make it clear that the family $\{f_n - f : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is also uniformly integrable of order p. Given $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\int_{\{|f-f_n|<\epsilon\}} |f - f_n|^p d\mu \leq \epsilon^p \mu(X).$$

On the other hand, $\mu(\{|f - f_n| \geq \epsilon\}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ because of the convergence in measure, and so

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\{|f-f_n|\geq\epsilon\}} |f - f_n|^p d\mu = 0$$

by definition of uniform integrability. The conclusion follows. □

Definition 20. *For* $p = \gamma(s_0) \in \Gamma$*, we say that a sequence* $\{f_n\}$ *of functions in* $L^2(\sigma)$ *satisfying* $\|f_n\|_2 \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$ concentrates at p *if for every* $\epsilon, r > 0$ *there exists* $N \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that, for every* $n \geq N$*,*

$$\int_{|s-s_0|\geq r} |f_n(\gamma(s))|^2 ds < \epsilon.$$

These introductory remarks are relevant in the context of the following concentration-compactness result which is a consequence of Proposition 16:

Proposition 21. *Let* $\{f_n\}$ *be an extremizing sequence for* (2) *of nonnegative functions in* $L^2(\sigma)$. *Then there exists a subsequence, again denoted* $\{f_n\}$, *and a decomposition* $f_n = F_n + G_n$ *where* F_n *and* G_n *are nonnegative with disjoint supports,* $\|G_n\|_2 \to 0$, *and* $\{F_n\}$ *satisfies one of the two possibilities:*

$$\{F_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \textit{ is uniformly integrable of order } 2. \tag{41}$$

$$\{F_n\} \textit{ concentrates at a point of } \Gamma. \tag{42}$$

Proof. Apply Proposition 16 to each element of the sequence $\{f_n\}$ to get a decomposition $f_n = F_n + G_n$ where $F_n, G_n \geq 0$ have disjoint supports and $\|G_n\|_2 \to 0$. For each n, there exists a cap $\mathcal{C}_n = \mathcal{C}(\gamma(s_n), r_n)$ such that F_n is upper normalized with respect to $\mathcal{C}_n$. It is important to note that Proposition 16 yields a uniform statement in n i.e. the gauge function Θ in conditions (28) and (29) can be chosen independently of n. Let $r^* := \limsup_{n\to\infty} r_n$.

If $r^* > 0$, let $\{r_{n_k}\}_k$ be a subsequence which converges to r^*. Renaming, we may assume that $\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n = r^*$. Choosing $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $n \geq N$ implies $r_n \geq r^*/4$, we have

$$\int_{\{F_n > R\}} F_n(\gamma(s))^2 ds \leq \int_{\{F_n \geq \frac{R\sqrt{r^*}}{2} r_n^{-1/2}\}} F_n(\gamma(s))^2 ds \leq \Theta\Big(\frac{R\sqrt{r^*}}{2}\Big),$$

which tends to 0 as $R \to \infty$, uniformly in n. In other words, the sequence $\{F_n\}$ is uniformly integrable of order 2.

If $r^* = 0$, choose a subsequence $\{s_{n_k}\}_k$ converging to some $s^* \in [0, \ell]$. Renaming, we may assume that $\lim_{n\to\infty} s_n = s^*$. Let $\epsilon, r > 0$ be given. Start by choosing $N_1 = N_1(r)$ such that $|s_n - s^*| \leq r/2$ if $n > N_1$. Then $|s - s^*| \geq r$ implies $|s - s_n| \geq r/2$ if $n > N_1$. Choose $R = R(\epsilon)$ such that $\Theta(R) < \epsilon$. Finally, choose $N_2 = N_2(\epsilon, r)$ such that

$$r_n \leq \frac{r}{2R} \text{ if } n > N_2.$$

Such N_2 exists since $\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n = 0$. If $n > \max\{N_1, N_2\}$, we then have that

$$\int_{|s-s^*|\geq r} F_n(\gamma(s))^2 ds \leq \int_{|s-s_n|\geq \frac{r}{2}} F_n(\gamma(s))^2 ds \leq \int_{|s-s_n|\geq Rr_n} F_n(\gamma(s))^2 ds \leq \Theta(R) < \epsilon$$

i.e. the sequence $\{F_n\}$ concentrates at $\gamma(s^*)$. $\square$

Fanelli, Vega and Visciglia [11] proved the following interesting modification of a well-known result of Brézis and Lieb [2] which does not require the a.e. pointwise convergence of the sequence of functions $\{h_n\}$.

Proposition 22 ([11])**.** *Let* $\mathcal{H}$ *be a Hilbert space and* T *be a bounded linear operator from* $\mathcal{H}$ *to* $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, *for some* $p \in (2, \infty)$. *Let* $\{h_n\} \in \mathcal{H}$ *be such that*

(i) $\|h_n\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$;
(ii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Th_n\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|T\|$;

(iii) $h_n \rightharpoonup h \neq 0$;
(iv) $Th_n \to Th$ *a.e. in* $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Then $h_n \to h$ *in* $\mathcal{H}$*; in particular,* $\|h\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$ *and* $\|Th\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|T\|$.

We will be applying this proposition to the adjoint Fourier restriction operator on Γ with $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\sigma)$. We lose no generality in assuming that conditions (i) and (ii) are automatically satisfied by any extremizing sequence $\{f_n\}$. After passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\{f_n\}$ converges weakly in $L^2(\sigma)$ by Alaoglu's theorem. If $f_n \rightharpoonup f$ in $L^2(\sigma)$, then condition (iv) follows because σ is compactly supported. Thus Proposition 22 states that, for compactly supported measures, the only obstruction to the existence of extremizers is the possibility that every L^2 weak limit of any extremizing sequence be zero.

The advantage of working with *nonnegative* extremizing sequences in this context first appeared in the work of Kunze [15]. The following is the sole step in the analysis which works only for nonnegative extremizing sequences:

Lemma 23. *Let* $\{f_n\}$ *and* $\{F_n\}$ *be as in Proposition 21. Suppose that* $\{F_n\}$ *satisfies condition* (41)*. Then* $\{f_n\}$ *is precompact in* $L^2(\sigma)$.

Proof. By assumption the sequence $\{F_n\}$ consists of nonnegative functions and is uniformly integrable of order 2. Moreover, $\|F_n\|_2 \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$.

We first show that every L^2 weak limit of $\{F_n\}$ is nonzero. The set of L^2 weak limits of $\{F_n\}$ is clearly nonempty. We can assume, possibly after extraction of a subsequence, that $F_n \rightharpoonup F$ for some $F \in L^2(\sigma)$. Suppose that $F = 0$ a.e. on Γ. Then

$$\int_\Gamma F_n d\sigma \to \int_\Gamma F d\sigma = 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Since $F_n \geq 0$, this means that the sequence $\{F_n\}$ converges to 0 in $L^1(\sigma)$, and thus $F_n \to 0$ in measure. In view of Proposition 19, $F_n \to 0$ in $L^2(\sigma)$, and so $1 = \|F_n\|_2 \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, a contradiction. Thus $F \neq 0$ as was to be shown.

We use this to prove that the sequence $\{f_n\}$ is precompact. Since $f_n = F_n + G_n$, we have that

$$\|\widehat{F_n\sigma}\|_6 \geq \|\widehat{f_n\sigma}\|_6 - \|\widehat{G_n\sigma}\|_6 \geq \|\widehat{f_n\sigma}\|_6 - \mathbf{C}[\Gamma]\|G_n\|_2.$$

It follows that $\|\widehat{F_n\sigma}\|_6 \to \mathbf{C}[\Gamma]$ as $n \to \infty$. This means that $\{F_n\}$ is itself an extremizing sequence. By the previous paragraph, we can assume, possibly after extraction of a subsequence, that $F_n \rightharpoonup F$ for some nonzero $F \in L^2(\sigma)$. Then an application of Proposition 22 (with $d = 2$, $p = 6$, $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\sigma)$ and T = Fourier extension operator on Γ defined by $Tf := \widehat{f\sigma}$) allows us to conclude that $f_n \to F$ in $L^2(\sigma)$ as $n \to \infty$, and so $\{f_n\}$ is precompact. $\square$

We will be done with the proof of Theorem 3 once we show that condition (42) in Proposition 21 cannot happen, and this is the subject of the next two sections.

7. Exploring concentration

We start by recalling some aspects of Foschi's work [13]. Consider the parabola

$$\mathbb{P} := \{(y,z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : z = y^2\}$$

equipped with projection measure[3] $d\sigma_{\mathbb{P}} := dy$ instead of arclength measure. We have an inequality

$$\|\widehat{f\sigma_{\mathbb{P}}}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \mathbf{C}_F \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma_{\mathbb{P}})}, \tag{43}$$

where $\mathbf{C}_F$ denotes again the optimal constant. Foschi showed that extremizers exist for the inequality (43) and computed the optimal constant

$$\mathbf{C}_F = \frac{(2\pi)^{1/2}}{12^{1/12}}. \tag{44}$$

An example of one such extremizer is given by the Gaussian $G(y) := e^{-y^2}$. Other extremizers are obtained from G by space-time translations, parabolic dilations, space rotations, phase shifts and Galilean transformations.

A straightforward scaling argument shows the following: consider the dilated parabola

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu := \Big\{(y,z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : z = \frac{\mu y^2}{2}\Big\},$$

again equipped with projection measure $d\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\mu} = dy$. Then the optimal constant in the inequality

$$\|\widehat{f\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \mathbf{C}_F[\mu] \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\mu})} \tag{45}$$

satisfies $\mathbf{C}_F[\mu] = \mathbf{C}_F[1]\mu^{-1/6}$. In particular, $\mathbf{C}_F[1] = (2\pi)^{1/2}3^{-1/12}$.

Since projection measure can be regarded as a limit of arclength measures, the analysis of extremizers for inequality (45) is of significance for our discussion. If an extremizing sequence $\{f_n\}$ for inequality (2) concentrates at a point $\gamma(s) \in \Gamma$, then the sequence consisting of certain natural transplantations of f_n to functions $\tilde{f}_n$ (each $\tilde{f}_n$ begin defined on the limiting parabola) will also be an extremizing sequence for (45) with $\mu = \kappa(\gamma(s))$. To see why this is the case, denote by $T_{s,r}$ the restriction of the Fourier extension operator to a given cap $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s,r) \subset \Gamma$:

$$T_{s,r} f(x,t) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} f(y) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot y} d\sigma(y) = \int_{s-r}^{s+r} f(\gamma(s)) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot\gamma(s)} ds.$$

We are interested in the operator norm $\|T_{s,r}\| := \sup_{0\neq f \in L^2(\sigma)} \|T_{s,r} f\|_6 \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^{-1}$, and prove the following result:

Proposition 24. *For every* $s \in (0,\ell)$,

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+} \|T_{s,r}\| = \mathbf{C}_F[\kappa(\gamma(s))].$$

---

[3] See [7] and the references therein for a discussion of why this measure is natural from a geometric point of view.

Proof. Fix $s \in (0, \ell)$ and let $\kappa := \kappa(\gamma(s))$. That the lefthand side is greater than or equal to the righthand side can be easily seen by taking the function $G(y) = e^{-\frac{\kappa y^2}{2}}$ and considering the dilated family $G_\delta(y) = \delta^{-1/2} G(\delta^{-1} y)$ for $\delta > 0$. For details, see §8.3 below.

So we focus on proving the reverse inequality. Let $\sigma_{s,r}$ denote the restriction of arclength measure σ to the cap $\mathcal{C}(s,r)$, and denote the triple convolution of $\sigma_{s,r}$ with itself by $\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)} := \sigma_{s,r} * \sigma_{s,r} * \sigma_{s,r}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_{s,r} f\|_6^6 &= (2\pi)^2 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f\sigma_{s,r} * f\sigma_{s,r} * f\sigma_{s,r}(\xi,\tau)|^2 d\xi d\tau \\
&\leq (2\pi)^2 \iint |f|^2\sigma_{s,r} * |f|^2\sigma_{s,r} * |f|^2\sigma_{s,r}(\xi,\tau) \cdot \sigma_{s,r} * \sigma_{s,r} * \sigma_{s,r}(\xi,\tau) d\xi d\tau \\
&\leq (2\pi)^2 \sup_{(\xi,\tau)\in \operatorname{supp}(\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)})} \sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)}(\xi,\tau) \cdot \iint |f|^2\sigma_{s,r} * |f|^2\sigma_{s,r} * |f|^2\sigma_{s,r}(\xi,\tau) d\xi d\tau \\
&= (2\pi)^2 \|\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma_{s,r})}^6,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Hölder's inequality twice. It will then be enough to show that

$$\|\sigma_{s,r} * \sigma_{s,r} * \sigma_{s,r}\|_\infty \to \frac{\mathbf{C}_F[\kappa]^6}{(2\pi)^2} \text{ as } r \to 0^+.$$

After applying a rigid motion[4] of $\mathbb{R}^2$ to a cap $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s,r)$, we may parametrize it in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\gamma}_{s,r} : I_r &\to \mathbb{R}^2 \\
y &\mapsto \Big(y, g(y) = \tfrac{\kappa}{2} y^2 + \phi(y)\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

where I_r is an interval centered at the origin of length $\asymp r$, $\kappa = g''(0)(1+g'(0)^2)^{-3/2}$ is the curvature of Γ at $\gamma(s)$, and ϕ is a real-valued smooth function satisfying $\phi(y) = O(|y|^3)$ as $|y| \to 0$. We also let $\eta_r \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a mollified version of the characteristic function of the interval I_r: to accomplish this, fix $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on $[-1,1]$ and $\eta(\xi) = 0$ if $|\xi| \geq 2$, and define $\eta_r := \eta(2|I_r|^{-1} \cdot)$.

With these definitions we have that, for $|\xi| \leq |I_r|/2$,

$$\sigma_{s,r}(\xi,\tau) = G_r(\xi)\delta(\tau - g(\xi)) d\xi d\tau,$$

where $G_r(\xi) := (1+g'(\xi)^2)^{1/2}\eta_r(\xi)$ is a smooth function supported on $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R} : |\xi| \lesssim r\}$. Observe that G_r (and therefore $\sigma_{s,r}$) depends also on s, even though this is not explicitly indicated by the notation, with uniform bounds on s and appropriately uniform dependence on r after dilations. Following [13] and [22] we compute:

---

[4] For a more detailed discussion of this procedure, see §8.1 below.

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)}(\xi,\tau) &= \iint G_r(\omega_1)G_r(\omega_2-\omega_1)G_r(\xi-\omega_2)\delta(\tau-g(\omega_1)-g(\omega_2-\omega_1)-g(\xi-\omega_2))d\omega_1 d\omega_2\\ &= \iiint_{|\omega|\lesssim r} G_r(\omega_1)G_r(\omega_2)G_r(\omega_3)\delta\begin{pmatrix}\tau-g(\omega_1)-g(\omega_2)-g(\omega_3)\\ \xi-\omega_1-\omega_2-\omega_3\end{pmatrix}d\omega_1 d\omega_2 d\omega_3.\end{aligned}$$

Change variables $\omega = O\cdot\zeta$, where $O\in SO(3)$ is the orthogonal matrix

$$O=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Under this transformation,

$$\langle(1,1,1),\omega\rangle = \langle(1,1,1),O\cdot\zeta\rangle = \langle O^*\cdot(1,1,1),\zeta\rangle = \sqrt{3}\langle(1,0,0),\zeta\rangle = \sqrt{3}\zeta_1.$$

The integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)}(\xi,\tau) = \iiint_{|\zeta|\lesssim r} & G_r\Big(\frac{\zeta_1}{\sqrt{3}}-\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)G_r\Big(\frac{\zeta_1}{\sqrt{3}}+\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)G_r\Big(\frac{\zeta_1}{\sqrt{3}}+\frac{2\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)\cdot\\ &\cdot\delta\begin{pmatrix}\tau-g(\frac{\zeta_1}{\sqrt{3}}-\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}})-g(\frac{\zeta_1}{\sqrt{3}}+\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}})-g(\frac{\zeta_1}{\sqrt{3}}+\frac{2\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}})\\ \xi-\sqrt{3}\zeta_1\end{pmatrix}d\zeta_1 d\zeta_2 d\zeta_3.\end{aligned}$$

Renaming variables and setting

$$\mathfrak{G}_r(\xi;\zeta_2,\zeta_3) = G_r\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}-\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)G_r\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)G_r\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\frac{2\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big),$$

this simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)}(\xi,\tau) = \frac{\chi(|\xi|\lesssim r)}{\sqrt{3}}&\iint_{|(\zeta_2,\zeta_3)|\lesssim r}\mathfrak{G}_r(\xi;\zeta_2,\zeta_3)\cdot\\ &\cdot\delta\Big(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-\frac{\kappa}{2}|\zeta|^2-\phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}-\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)-\phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\frac{\zeta_2}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)-\phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\frac{2\zeta_3}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)\Big)d\zeta_2 d\zeta_3.\end{aligned}$$

Introducing polar coordinates on the (ζ_2,ζ_3)-plane,

$$\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)}(\xi,\tau) = \frac{\chi(|\xi|\lesssim r)}{\sqrt{3}}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_{0\leq\rho\lesssim r}\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_r(\xi;\rho,\theta)\delta\Big(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}\Big)-\psi(\xi;\rho,\theta)\Big)\rho d\rho d\theta$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_r(\xi;\rho,\theta) = G_r\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}-\rho\Big(\frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{2}}+\frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)\Big)G_r\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\rho\Big(\frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)\Big)G_r\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\rho\sin\theta\Big)$$

and

$$\psi(\xi;\rho,\theta)=\frac{\kappa}{2}\rho^2-3\phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}\Big)+\phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}-\rho\Big(\frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{2}}+\frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)\Big)+ \phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\rho\Big(\frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{6}}\Big)\Big)+\phi\Big(\frac{\xi}{3}+\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\rho\sin\theta\Big). \tag{46}$$

We prepare to change variables again. Recall the assumption that $\kappa>0$. Note that $\psi(\xi;0,\theta)=0$ and $\psi(\xi;\rho,\theta)>0$ for every sufficiently small $\rho>0$. Moreover, a calculation shows that the same thing happens with first derivatives: $\partial_\rho\psi(\xi;0,\theta)=0$ and $\partial_\rho\psi(\xi;\rho,\theta)>0$ if $\rho>0$ is sufficiently small. We also have that $\partial_\rho^2\psi(\xi;0,\theta)=\kappa+\phi''(\xi/3)=g''(\xi/3)$.

For $u\geq 0$, set $\rho=\rho(u):=\psi^{-1}(u)$, and compute:

$$\sigma_{s,r}^{(*3)}(\xi,\tau)=\frac{\chi(|\xi|\lesssim r)}{\sqrt{3}}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_{0\leq u\leq C\psi}\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_r(\xi;\rho(u),\theta)\delta\Big(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3})-u\Big)\frac{\rho(u)}{\partial_\rho\psi(\rho(u))}dud\theta \tag{47}$$

$$=\frac{\chi(|\xi|\lesssim r)}{\sqrt{3}}\int_0^{2\pi}\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_r(\xi;\rho(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3})),\theta)\frac{\rho(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3}))}{\partial_\rho\psi(\rho(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3})))}d\theta. \tag{48}$$

Note that, for each $\theta\in[0,2\pi]$, the integrand in (48) is supported in the region

$$\Big\{(\xi,\tau)\in\mathbb{R}^2:0\leq\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3})\leq C\psi(\xi;r,\theta)\Big\},$$

where the constant $C<\infty$ is large enough that the restriction $u\leq C\psi(\xi;r,\theta)$ in the inner integral of (47) becomes redundant because of support limitations on factors present in its integrand. From expression (48) it is clear that the restriction of $\sigma_{s,r}*\sigma_{s,r}*\sigma_{s,r}$ to its support defines a continuous function of (ξ,τ) at $(0,0)$. Indeed, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_r$ is a smooth function of compact support in the variables ξ,θ and $(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3}))^{1/2}$. Additionally, as $(\xi,\tau)\to(0,0)$,

$$\frac{\rho(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3}))}{\partial_\rho\psi(\rho(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3})))}=\frac{\rho(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3}))-\rho(0)}{\partial_\rho\psi(\rho(\tau-\frac{\kappa}{6}\xi^2-3\phi(\frac{\xi}{3})))-\partial_\rho\psi(\rho(0))}\to\frac{1}{\partial_\rho^2\psi(\rho(0))}=\frac{1}{g''(0)}.$$

If $(\xi,\tau)\in\operatorname{supp}(\sigma_{r,s}*\sigma_{r,s}*\sigma_{r,s})$ and $r\to 0^+$, then $(\xi,\tau)\to(0,0)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{r\to0^+}\|\sigma_{r,s}*\sigma_{r,s}*\sigma_{r,s}\|_\infty&=\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\int_0^{2\pi}\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_0(0;\rho(0),\theta)\frac{1}{\partial_\rho^2\psi(0;\rho(0),\theta)}d\theta.\\&=\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\frac{(1+g'(0)^2)^{3/2}}{g''(0)}=\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\frac{1}{\kappa}=\frac{\mathbf{C}_F[\kappa]^6}{(2\pi)^2},\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

An immediate consequence is that an extremizing sequence which concentrates must do so at a point of minimal curvature:

Corollary 25. *Let* $\{f_n\} \subset L^2(\sigma)$ *be an extremizing sequence of nonnegative functions for inequality* (2)*. Suppose that* $\{f_n\}$ *concentrates at a point* $\gamma(s) \in \Gamma$*. Then* $\kappa(\gamma(s)) = \lambda$*.*

Corollary 26. *Let* $\{f_n\}$ *and* $\{F_n\}$ *be as in Proposition 21. Suppose that* $\{F_n\}$ *concentrates at a point* $\gamma(s) \in \Gamma$*. Then* $\kappa(\gamma(s)) = \lambda$*.*

8. Comparing optimal constants

As was mentioned before, a potential obstruction to the existence of extremizers for inequality (2), and certainly to the precompactness of arbitrary nonnegative extremizing sequences, is the possibility that for an extremizing sequence satisfying $\|f_n\|_{L^2(\sigma)} = 1$, $|f_n|^2$ could conceivably converge weakly to a Dirac mass at a point on the curve. Indeed, let $p \in \Gamma$. The osculating parabola of Γ at p is $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(p)}$. If $\mathbf{C}[\Gamma]$ were equal to $\mathbf{C}_F[\kappa(p)]$, then Foschi's work implies that there would necessarily exist extremizing sequences of the type just described. Therefore an essential step in our analysis is to determine under which conditions one has that

$$\mathbf{C}[\Gamma] > \max_{p\in\Gamma} \mathbf{C}_F[\kappa(p)] = \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda].$$

The main goal of this section is to prove the following:

Proposition 27. *Let* $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ *be an arc satisfying the conditions of Theorem 3. Then* $\mathbf{C}[\Gamma] > \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]$*.*

8.1. Introducing local coordinates.

Let $p_0 \in \Gamma$ be a point of minimum curvature i.e. such that $\kappa(p_0) = \lambda$. We will be assuming that p_0 is *not* an endpoint of Γ, and we postpone the discussion of the validity of this assumption until the end of this section. By translating the curve we can assume without loss of generality that $p_0 = (0, 0)$. Possibly after a suitable rotation, the arc Γ can be parametrized in a neighborhood of the origin in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\gamma} : I &\to \mathbb{R}^2 \\ y &\mapsto (y, h(y)), \end{aligned}$$

where[5]

$$h(y) = \frac{\lambda y^2}{2} + ay^4 + \psi(y)$$

and ψ is a real-valued smooth function satisfying $\psi(y) = O(|y|^5)$ as $|y| \to 0$. The parameter a, on the other hand, is a function of the second derivative of the curvature with respect to arclength at 0; see formula (51) below. We take $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ to be an interval centered at the origin which will be chosen as a function of λ, a and ψ later on. Finally, let $\eta_I \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a mollified version of the characteristic function of I such that $\eta_I \equiv 1$ on I and $\eta_I \equiv 0$

---

[5] There is no cubic term in the expression for h because by assumption the curvature has a minimum at $\gamma(0) = (0, 0) = p_0$. Constant and linear terms were likewise removed via the affine change of variables described above.

outside $2\cdot I$. As before, we accomplish this by fixing $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on $[-1,1]$ and $\eta(y) = 0$ if $|y| \geq 2$, and defining $\eta_I := \eta(2|I|^{-1}\cdot)$.

These data determine a compact arc $\widetilde{\gamma}(I) =: \widetilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$ in the plane, which comes equipped with arclength measure $\widetilde{\sigma}$ given, for $y \in I$, by

$$d\widetilde{\sigma}(y) = (1 + h'(y)^2)^{1/2}\eta_I(y)dy. \tag{49}$$

Taylor expanding around $y = 0$, we note that the first two non-zero terms in the expansion of $d\widetilde{\sigma}(y)$ are independent of a and ψ:

$$d\widetilde{\sigma}(y) = \Big(1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}y^2 + O(y^4)\Big)\eta_I(y)dy. \tag{50}$$

On the other hand, the curvature of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ at a point $\widetilde{\gamma}(y)$ is given, for small y, by

$$\kappa(y) = \frac{h''(y)}{(1 + h'(y)^2)^{3/2}} = \lambda + (12a - \frac{3\lambda^3}{2})y^2 + O_{\lambda,a,\psi}(y^4).$$

We have that $\kappa(0) = h''(0) = \lambda > 0$. For κ to have a minimum at $y = 0$ it is necessary that $a \geq (\frac{\lambda}{2})^3$. Let s denote, as usual, the arclength parameter for $\widetilde{\Gamma}$. Then, by a straightforward application of the chain rule, we have that

$$\frac{d^2\kappa}{ds^2}(0) = \frac{d^2\kappa}{dy^2}(0) = 24a - 3\lambda^3, \tag{51}$$

and so hypothesis (3) in Theorem 3 is equivalent to $a < \frac{3}{2}(\frac{\lambda}{2})^3$. All in all we have that

$$\Big(\frac{\lambda}{2}\Big)^3 \leq a < \frac{3}{2}\Big(\frac{\lambda}{2}\Big)^3. \tag{52}$$

In what follows, we will again denote by $\mathbf{C}[\widetilde{\Gamma}] = \mathbf{C}[\widetilde{\Gamma}; \lambda, a, \psi, I]$ the optimal constant in the inequality

$$\|\widehat{f\widetilde{\sigma}}\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \mathbf{C}[\widetilde{\Gamma}]\|f\|_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})}. \tag{53}$$

8.2. **The unperturbed case.** If $a = \psi = 0$, we are dealing with the unperturbed parabola $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$. As we have mentioned before, the corresponding optimal constant satisfies $\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda] = \mathbf{C}_F[1]\lambda^{-1/6}$, and examples of extremizers are given by Gaussian functions $e^{-\rho y^2/2}$ for $\rho > 0$.

Set $G_0(y) := e^{-\lambda y^2/2}$, and consider functions of the form $f = G_0 + \phi$ with $\phi \in L^2(\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda})$. Consider the corresponding functional

$$\phi \mapsto \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |G_0 + \phi|^2 dy\Big)^3 - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} |G_1 + \phi_1|^6 dxdt \geq 0, \tag{54}$$

where $G_1(x,t) := \widehat{G_0\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}}(-x,t)$ and $\phi_1(x,t) := \widehat{\phi\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}}(-x,t)$. The former can be explicitly computed:

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(x,t) =& \widehat{G_0\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}}(-x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_0(y) e^{-it\frac{\lambda y^2}{2}} e^{ixy} dy \\ =& \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-(1+it)\frac{\lambda y^2}{2}} e^{ixy} dy \\ =& \Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^{1/2} (1+it)^{-1/2} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\lambda(1+it)}}. \end{aligned}$$

One readily checks that $G_1 \in L^p_{x,t}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ if and only if $p > 4$, but we are interested in L^6 norms. Since $\widehat{G_0\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}}$ is an even function of x,

$$\|G_1\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)} = \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda] \|G_0\|_{L^2(\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda})}. \tag{55}$$

We follow the work of [9] and expand the functional (54) up to second order, collecting the terms which do not depend on ϕ in $\mathbf{I}$, the ones which depend linearly on the real and imaginary parts of ϕ in $\mathbf{II}$, and the ones which depend quadratically on the real and imaginary parts of ϕ in $\mathbf{III}$. This yields:

$$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 \|G_0\|_2^6 - \|G_1\|_6^6; \tag{56}$$

$$\mathbf{II} = 6\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 \|G_0\|_2^4 \Re \int G_0 \phi - 6\Re \iint |G_1|^4 \overline{G_1} \phi_1; \tag{57}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{III} = 3\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 \|G_0\|_2^4 \int |\phi|^2 + 12\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 \|G_0\|_2^2 \Big(\Re \int G_0\phi\Big)^2 \\ - 9\iint |G_1|^4 |\phi_1|^2 - 6\Re \iint |G_1|^2 \overline{G_1}^2 \phi_1^2. \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

We already know from (55) that $\mathbf{I} = 0$. Since G_0 is an extremizer, we have that $\mathbf{II} = 0$ as well. Finally, note that $\mathbf{III}$ is, by definition, a quadratic form in ϕ; denote it by $Q(\phi)$. By the symmetries of the problem (respectively, multiplication by a real number, phase shift, space translation, Galilean invariance, scaling and time translation), we have that

$$Q(G_0) = Q(iG_0) = Q(yG_0) = Q(iyG_0) = Q(y^2 G_0) = Q(iy^2 G_0) = 0, \tag{59}$$

and it is proved in [9] that Q is positive definite in the subspace of L^2 functions which are orthogonal to the functions indicated in (59). This non-degeneracy property will not be used here; rather, what is essential for our application is that $Q(\phi) \geq 0$ for every $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. This is immediate because $\mathbf{II}$ vanishes for every $\phi \in L^2$ and (54) defines a nonnegative quantity.

8.3. **A variational calculation.** In the spirit of the variational calculation in [7, §17], we consider the one-parameter family of trial functions given by

$$(G_0+\epsilon\varphi)_{0<\epsilon\leq\epsilon_0},$$

for some sufficiently small $\epsilon_0>0$, where $G_0(y)=e^{-\lambda y^2/2}$ and $\varphi\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ will be chosen below, in such a way that

$$\|\varphi\|_2=1 \text{ and } \int G_0\varphi=0. \tag{60}$$

For technical reasons that will become apparent soon, we introduce an appropriate dilation of the cut-off η_I which localizes to the region $|y|\lesssim\epsilon\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}$, and define

$$f_\epsilon(y):=\epsilon^{-1/2}(G_0+\epsilon\varphi)(\epsilon^{-1}y)\eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}}y\Big). \tag{61}$$

Notice that the family $(f_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is L^2-normalized in the sense that

$$\|f_\epsilon\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})}=\|G_0\|_2^2+O(\epsilon^2) \text{ as } \epsilon\to0^+. \tag{62}$$

Consider the quantity:

$$\Xi(\epsilon)=\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\|f_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})}-\|\widehat{f_\epsilon\widetilde{\sigma}}\|_6^6. \tag{63}$$

This is no longer a nonnegative expression by construction like (54).

Let

$$\varphi(u):=c_\lambda u e^{-\frac{\lambda u^2}{2}}, \tag{64}$$

where the constant $c_\lambda:=(\pi/4\lambda^3)^{-1/4}$ is chosen to normalize $\|\varphi\|_2=1$. Then φ satisfies conditions (60) and $Q(\varphi)=0$.

With this choice of φ, we claim that the function $\Xi=\Xi(\epsilon)$ has the following property: for every $\lambda>0$, for every $a\in\mathbb{R}$ satisfying (52), and for every real-valued smooth ψ satisfying $\psi(y)=O(|y|^5)$ as $|y|\to0$, Ξ is a strictly concave function of ϵ in a sufficiently small half-neighborhood of 0, provided the interval I is chosen sufficiently small (as a function of λ,a and ψ). Once we prove this we will be able to conclude that $\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]<\mathbf{C}[\widetilde{\Gamma}]$, and Proposition 27 follows.

Start by noting that $\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\Xi(\epsilon)=0$ and $\Xi'(0)=0$. Indeed, one has that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\Xi(\epsilon)=\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\|f_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})}-\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\|\widehat{f_\epsilon\widetilde{\sigma}}\|_6^6=\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\|G_0\|_2^6-\|G_1\|_6^6=0$$

for every $a\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda>0$. On the other hand, explicit computations show that

$$\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0}\|f_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})}=6\|G_0\|_2^4\Re\int G_0\varphi$$

and

$$\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0}\|\widehat{f_\epsilon\widetilde{\sigma}}\|_6^6=6\Re\iint|G_1|^4\overline{G_1}\varphi_1.$$

Since $\mathbf{II} = 0$ and $G_0 \perp \varphi$, we have that

$$\Re \iint |G_1|^4 \overline{G_1} \varphi_1 = \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda] \|G_0\|_2^4 \Re \int G_0 \varphi = 0 \tag{65}$$

and it follows that $\Xi'(0) = 0$, as claimed.

Useful information will come from looking at second variations. The strategy will be to compute the second derivatives with respect to ϵ (at $\epsilon = 0$) of good enough approximations to the two terms appearing in the definition of Ξ. We start by analyzing the most involved one.

8.3.1. *The term* $\|\widehat{f_\epsilon \widetilde{\sigma}}\|_6^6$. To make the notation less cumbersome, we introduce the following parametrization:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \widetilde{\gamma}_\epsilon : \epsilon^{-1} \cdot I & \to & \mathbb{R}^2 \\ u & \mapsto & \Big(u, \widetilde{h}_\epsilon(u) = \frac{\lambda u^2}{2} + a\epsilon^2 u^4 + \epsilon^{-2}\psi(\epsilon u)\Big). \end{array}$$

Changing variables $y = \epsilon u$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{f_\epsilon \widetilde{\sigma}}(x,t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\epsilon(y) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot(y,h(y))} (1 + h'(y)^2)^{1/2} \eta_I(y) dy \\ &= \epsilon^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u) e^{-i(\epsilon x, \epsilon^2 t)\cdot(u, \widetilde{h}_\epsilon(u))} (1 + h'(\epsilon u)^2)^{1/2} \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} u\Big) du. \end{aligned}$$

Consider an approximate version of

$$\begin{aligned} w_\epsilon(x,t) :=& \epsilon^{-1/2} \widehat{f_\epsilon \widetilde{\sigma}}(\epsilon^{-1}x, \epsilon^{-2}t) \\ =& \int_{\mathbb{R}} (G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot(u,\widetilde{h}_\epsilon(u))} (1 + h'(\epsilon u)^2)^{1/2} \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} u\Big) du \end{aligned}$$

given by Taylor expanding $J_\epsilon(u) := \sqrt{1 + h'(\epsilon u)^2} \in C^\infty(I)$ and defining

$$v_\epsilon(x,t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot(u,\widetilde{h}_\epsilon(u))} \Big(1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\epsilon^2 u^2\Big) \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} u\Big) du. \tag{66}$$

Also, set

$$g_\epsilon(u) := (G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u), \quad g_\epsilon^\sharp(u) := u^2 (G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u) \text{ and } d\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon(u) := (1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\epsilon^2 u^2) du.$$

Lemma 28. *If I is a sufficiently small interval centered at the origin (chosen as a function of λ, a, ψ but not ϵ), then*

$$\|\widehat{f_\epsilon \widetilde{\sigma}}\|_6^6 = \|w_\epsilon\|_6^6 = \|v_\epsilon\|_6^6 + O(\epsilon^4) \tag{67}$$

and

$$\|f_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})}^2 = \|g_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon)}^2 + O(\epsilon^4). \tag{68}$$

as $\epsilon \to 0^+$.

Proof. By construction, v_ϵ is just w_ϵ with the term $J_\epsilon = (1 + h'(\epsilon\cdot)^2)^{1/2}$ replaced by its Taylor approximation to order 2. For $\epsilon < 1$, set

$$G_\epsilon(u) := (1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\epsilon^2 u^2)(G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u)$$

and

$$s_\epsilon(x,t) := -\int_{\mathbb{R}} G_\epsilon(u) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot\widetilde{\gamma}_\epsilon(u)}\Big(\eta_I(\epsilon u) - \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}}u\Big)\Big)du.$$

It follows that

$$v_\epsilon(x,t) = \widehat{g_\epsilon\sigma_{P,\epsilon}}(x,t) + \frac{\lambda^2\epsilon^2}{2}\widehat{g_\epsilon^\sharp\sigma_{P,\epsilon}}(x,t) + s_\epsilon(x,t), \tag{69}$$

where $d\sigma_{P,\epsilon} = \eta_I(\epsilon u)du$. We obtain a uniform estimate for its L^6 norm:

Claim 29. *There exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that $\|v_\epsilon\|_6 \leq C$, for every sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.*

The claimed uniformity in ϵ needs to be justified: it follows from undoing the substitutions $y \mapsto \epsilon^{-1}y$ and $(x,t) \mapsto (\epsilon^{-1}x, \epsilon^{-2}t)$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{g_\epsilon\sigma_{P,\epsilon}}(x,t) &= \int g_\epsilon(u)e^{-i(x,t)\cdot(u,\widetilde{h}_\epsilon(u))}\eta_I(\epsilon u)du\\ &=\epsilon^{-1/2}\int \epsilon^{-1/2}(G_0+\epsilon\varphi)(\epsilon^{-1}y)e^{-(\epsilon^{-1}x,\epsilon^{-2}t)\cdot(y,h(y))}\eta_I(y)dy\\ &=\epsilon^{-1/2}\widehat{f_\epsilon\sigma_P}(\epsilon^{-1}x,\epsilon^{-2}t),\end{aligned}$$

where $d\sigma_P(y) := \eta_I(y)dy$. Since $\|\epsilon^{-1/2}\widehat{f_\epsilon\sigma_P}(\epsilon^{-1}\cdot,\epsilon^{-2}\cdot)\|_6 = \|\widehat{f_\epsilon\sigma_P}\|_6$, we have that

$$\|\widehat{g_\epsilon\sigma_{P,\epsilon}}\|_6 = \|\epsilon^{-1/2}\widehat{f_\epsilon\sigma_P}(\epsilon^{-1}\cdot,\epsilon^{-2}\cdot)\|_6 = \|\widehat{f_\epsilon\sigma_P}\|_6 \lesssim \|f_\epsilon\|_2 \leq C\|G_0\|_2,$$

for some $C < \infty$ independent of ϵ, as claimed. Proceed similarly to get a bound $O(\epsilon^2)$ for the term involving $g_\epsilon^\sharp$. Finally, define

$$g_\epsilon^\flat(u) := -G_\epsilon(u)\Big(\eta_I(\epsilon u) - \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}}u\Big)\Big)$$

and notice that $s_\epsilon(x,t) = \widehat{g_\epsilon^\flat\sigma_{P,\epsilon}}(x,t)$. Estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}\|g_\epsilon^\flat\|_2^2 &\asymp \int_{\log\epsilon^{-1}\lesssim|u|\lesssim\epsilon^{-1}}\Big(1 + c_\lambda\epsilon u + \frac{\lambda^2\epsilon^2}{2}u^2 + c_\lambda\frac{\lambda^2\epsilon^3}{2}u^3\Big)^2 e^{-\lambda u^2}du\\ &\lesssim e^{-C(\log\epsilon^{-1})^2} \lesssim_N \epsilon^N, \text{ for every } N \in \mathbb{N}.\end{aligned}$$

Eliminating the substitutions as before, we conclude that

$$\|s_\epsilon\|_6 \lesssim \|g_\epsilon^\flat\|_2 \lesssim \epsilon^N, \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N},$$

where the implicit constants are all independent of ϵ. Thus the contribution of the third summand is likewise small, and this concludes the verification of Claim 29.

If we choose the interval I small enough (as a function of λ, a and ψ) such that

$$y \in I \Rightarrow |h'(y)| = |\lambda y + 4ay^3 + \psi'(y)| \le 1,$$

then the remainder

$$r_\epsilon(x,t) := w_\epsilon(x,t) - v_\epsilon(x,t)$$

will satisfy favorable bounds. By Taylor's theorem we have that

$$|r_\epsilon(x,t)| \le C\epsilon^4 \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}} J_\epsilon''''(c_0) u^4 (G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot\widetilde{\gamma_\epsilon}(u)} \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} u\Big) du \Big|, \tag{70}$$

for some $c_0 \in (-\epsilon u, \epsilon u)$ and some absolute constant $C < \infty$. An argument analogous to the one used to establish Claim 29 yields the following estimate for the remainder term:

Claim 30. *There exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that $\|r_\epsilon\|_6 \le C\epsilon^4$, for every sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.*

To finish the proof of Lemma 28, notice that $\|w_\epsilon\|_6^6 = \|v_\epsilon + r_\epsilon\|_6^6 = \|v_\epsilon\|_6^6 + 63$ terms, all of which are $O(\epsilon^4)$ as $\epsilon \to 0^+$. This is an immediate consequence of Hölder's inequality, together with Claims 29 and 30: for example,

$$\iint |v_\epsilon|^4 \overline{v_\epsilon} r_\epsilon dxdt \le \|v_\epsilon\|_6^5 \|r_\epsilon\|_6 \le C\epsilon^4.$$

All other terms can be dealt with in a similar way, and the result follows. The verification of (68) is easier and we omit the details. $\square$

Since we are interested in second variations with respect to ϵ of the L^6 norm $\|\widehat{f_\epsilon\widetilde{\sigma}}\|_6^6$ at $\epsilon = 0$, it will suffice, in light of (67), to analyze $\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6$. Start by noting that

$$v_0(x,t) = G_1(x,t) \tag{71}$$

$$\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0} v_\epsilon(x,t) = \varphi_1(x,t) \tag{72}$$

$$\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0} v_\epsilon(x,t) = \lambda^2 G_2(x,t) - 2itaG_3(x,t) \tag{73}$$

where, as before,

$$G_1(x,t) := \widehat{G_0\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}}(-x,t) = \Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^{1/2} (1+it)^{-1/2} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\lambda(1+it)}}$$

and

$$\varphi_1(x,t) := \widehat{\varphi\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}}(-x,t) = \frac{ic_\lambda}{\lambda}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^{1/2} (1+it)^{-3/2} x e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\lambda(1+it)}}.$$

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} G_2(x,t) &:= [(u^2 G_0)\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}]^\wedge(-x,t) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} y^2 G_0(y) e^{-it\frac{\lambda y^2}{2}} e^{ixy} dy = 2\lambda^{-1} i \partial_t G_1(x,t) \\ &= \Big(\lambda^{-1}(1+it)^{-1} - \lambda^{-2}x^2(1+it)^{-2}\Big) G_1(x,t) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}G_3(x,t) &:= [(u^4G_0)\sigma_{\mathbb{P}_\lambda}]^\wedge(-x,t)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} y^4G_0(y)e^{-it\frac{\lambda y^2}{2}}e^{ixy}dy = -4\lambda^{-2}\partial_t^2G_1(x,t)\\ &= \Big(3\lambda^{-2}(1+it)^{-2} - 6\lambda^{-3}x^2(1+it)^{-3} + \lambda^{-4}x^4(1+it)^{-4}\Big)G_1(x,t).\end{aligned}$$

Remark 31. *The calculations to follow, which lead to formula* (74) *below, are largely formal and need to be justified. In particular, the fact that* $\epsilon \mapsto \|v_\epsilon\|_6^6$ *is twice differentiable at* $\epsilon = 0$ *is proved in Appendix 1.*

As a first step in the direction of computing $\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6$, we look at $\partial_\epsilon|v_\epsilon|^6(x,t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\epsilon|v_\epsilon|^6 &= \partial_\epsilon(v_\epsilon^3\overline{v_\epsilon}^3)\\ &= 3v_\epsilon^2(\partial_\epsilon v_\epsilon)\overline{v_\epsilon}^3 + 3\overline{v_\epsilon}^2(\partial_\epsilon\overline{v_\epsilon})v_\epsilon^3.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling (71)−(72), it follows that

$$\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0}|v_\epsilon|^6 = 6\Re(G_1^2\varphi_1\overline{G_1}^3)$$

and so (65) implies

$$\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0}\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6 = 6\Re\iint |G_1|^4\overline{G_1}\varphi_1dxdt = 0,$$

which we already knew. We differentiate once again and obtain

$$\partial_\epsilon^2|v_\epsilon|^6 = 2\Re\Big(6v_\epsilon(\partial_\epsilon v_\epsilon)^2\overline{v_\epsilon}^3 + 3v_\epsilon^2(\partial_\epsilon^2v_\epsilon)\overline{v_\epsilon}^3 + 9|v_\epsilon|^4|\partial_\epsilon v_\epsilon|^2\Big),$$

which at $\epsilon = 0$ equals (recall (71)−(73))

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}|v_\epsilon|^6 &= 2\Re\Big(6v_0(\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0}v_\epsilon)^2\overline{v_0}^3 + 3v_0^2(\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}v_\epsilon)\overline{v_0}^3 + 9|v_0|^4|\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0}v_\epsilon|^2\Big)\\ &= 2\Re\Big(6G_1\varphi_1^2\overline{G_1}^3 + 3G_1^2(\lambda^2G_2 - 2itaG_3)\overline{G_1}^3 + 9|G_1|^4|\varphi_1|^2\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6 = {}& 9\iint |G_1|^4|\varphi_1|^2dxdt + 6\Re\iint |G_1|^2\overline{G_1}^2\varphi_1^2dxdt\\ &+ 3\lambda^2\Re\iint |G_1|^4\overline{G_1}G_2dxdt - 6a\iint \Re\Big\{it|G_1|^4\overline{G_1}G_3\Big\}dxdt.\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

The first two summands on the right hand side of (74) appear (with opposite signs) in the expression (58) for the quadratic form Q. The last two summands, on the other hand, can be explicitly evaluated, and that is our next task. The proofs of the following claims are deferred to Appendix 2:

Claim 32.

$$3\lambda^2\Re\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|G_1(x,t)|^4\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_2(x,t)dxdt=\frac{3}{2}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6. \tag{75}$$

Claim 33.

$$-6a\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}\Re\Big\{it|G_1(x,t)|^4\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_3(x,t)\Big\}dxdt=-4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6. \tag{76}$$

It follows from (74), (75) and (76) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6=9\iint|G_1|^4|\varphi_1|^2dxdt+6\Re\iint|G_1|^2\overline{G_1}^2\varphi_1^2dxdt\\+\frac{3}{2}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6-4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6.\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

8.3.2. *The term* $\|f_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})}$. In view of (68), it will be enough to compute the approximate expression $\|g_\epsilon\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon)}$. Since $G_0\perp\varphi$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|g_\epsilon\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon)}&=\int_{\mathbb{R}}|(G_0+\epsilon\varphi)(u)|^2(1+\frac{\lambda^2}{2}u^2\epsilon^2)du\\&=\int|G_0(u)|^2du+\Big(\int|\varphi(u)|^2du+\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\int u^2|G_0(u)|^2du\Big)\epsilon^2\\&\quad+\Big(\lambda^2\Re\int u^2G_0(u)\varphi(u)du\Big)\epsilon^3+\Big(\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\int u^2|\varphi(u)|^2du\Big)\epsilon^4,\end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies $\partial_\epsilon|_{\epsilon=0}\|g_\epsilon\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon)}=0$ and

$$\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|g_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon)}=6\|G_0\|_2^4\Big(\int|\varphi(u)|^2du+\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\int u^2|G_0(u)|^2du\Big).$$

One last computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}6\|G_0\|_2^4\Big(\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\int u^2|G_0(u)|^2du\Big)&=3\lambda^2\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}e^{-\lambda u^2}du\Big)^2\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}u^2e^{-\lambda u^2}du\Big)\\&=3\lambda^2\frac{\pi}{\lambda}\frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2\lambda^{3/2}}=\frac{3}{2}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2},\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|g_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon)}=3\|G_0\|_2^4\int|\varphi(u)|^2du+\frac{3}{4}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}. \tag{78}$$

8.3.3. *Putting it all together.* Using the approximations (67) and (68) given by Lemma 28, we get that:

$$\frac{\Xi''(0)}{2} = \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 \frac{1}{2}\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|g_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma}_\epsilon)} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6.$$

The main terms in these approximations have been explicitly computed in (77) and (78). We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Xi''(0)}{2} = 3\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\|G_0\|_2^4\int|\varphi(s)|^2ds + \frac{3}{4}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2} - 9\iint|G_1|^4|\varphi_1|^2dxdt \\ - 6\Re\iint|G_1|^2\overline{G_1}^2\varphi_1^2dxdt - \frac{3}{2}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 + 4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition (58) of the quadratic form Q and the fact that $G_0 \perp \varphi$,

$$\frac{\Xi''(0)}{2} = Q(\varphi) - \frac{3}{4}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 + 4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6.$$

It follows that

$$\Xi(\epsilon) = \Big(Q(\varphi) - \frac{3}{4}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 + 4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\Big)\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3)$$

for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, and so Ξ is strictly concave in a neighborhood of 0 if and only if

$$Q(\varphi) - \frac{3}{4}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 + 4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 < 0,$$

that is, if and only if

$$a < \frac{3}{2}\Big(\frac{\lambda}{2}\Big)^3 - \frac{Q(\varphi)}{4\pi^{3/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6}\lambda^{7/2}.$$

The right hand side of this expression equals $\frac{3}{2}\Big(\frac{\lambda}{2}\Big)^3$ since $Q(\varphi) = 0$.

We have proved that, for the choice of φ given by (64), for every $\lambda > 0$, for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (52) and for every real-valued smooth ψ satisfying $\psi(y) = O(|y|^5)$ as $|y| \to 0$, Ξ is a strictly concave function of ϵ, for sufficiently small ϵ. In particular, $\Xi(\epsilon) < 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6\|f_\epsilon\|^6_{L^2(\widetilde{\sigma})} < \|\widehat{f_\epsilon\widetilde{\sigma}}\|_6^6.$$

Together with (53), this implies

$$\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda] < \mathbf{C}[\widetilde{\Gamma}].$$

Trivially, $\mathbf{C}[\widetilde{\Gamma}] \leq \mathbf{C}[\Gamma]$, and this finishes the proof of Proposition 27 modulo the work deferred to the Appendices.

Remark 34. *We have been working under the additional assumption that the curvature* κ *of* Γ *does not attain a global minimum at one of its endpoints. This represents no loss of generality. Indeed, if that were not the case and, say,* κ *attained a global minimum at* $p_0 = \gamma(0)$*, then we could perform an identical variational calculation with functions* f_ϵ *defined in a similar way to* (61) *but supported instead on small neighborhoods* $\widetilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon$ *of points* $p_\epsilon = \gamma(s_\epsilon) \in \Gamma$ *with* $|s_\epsilon| \asymp \epsilon$*. It is straightforward to check that the computation carries through. We omit the details.*

9. The end of the proof

Recall that by $T_{s,r}$ we mean the adjoint Fourier restriction operator on a cap $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s,r) \subset \Gamma$. The following (easy) estimate is the last one we need in order to finish the argument:

Lemma 35. *If a sequence* $\{f_n\} \subset L^2(\sigma)$ *concentrates at a point* $\gamma(s) \in \Gamma$*, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\widehat{f_n\sigma}\|_6 \leq \lim_{r\to 0^+} \lim_{n\to\infty} \|T_{s,r} f_n\|_6.$$

Proof. Set $Tf := \widehat{f\sigma}$, and let $r > 0$ be arbitrary. The Tomas-Stein inequality implies

$$\|(T - T_{s,r}) f_n\|_6 \lesssim \Big(\int_{\Gamma\setminus\mathcal{C}(s,r)} |f_n|^2 d\sigma \Big)^{1/2}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tf_n\|_6 &\leq \|T_{s,r} f_n\|_6 + \|(T - T_{s,r}) f_n\|_6 \\ &\leq \|T_{s,r} f_n\|_6 + C\Big(\int_{\Gamma\setminus\mathcal{C}(s,r)} |f_n|^2 d\sigma \Big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{f_n\}$ concentrates at $\gamma(s)$, we have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Tf_n\|_6 \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \|T_{s,r} f_n\|_6 + 0$$

for every $r > 0$. The result follows. ☐

We can now prove that condition (42) in Proposition 21 cannot happen i.e. that the sequence $\{F_n\}$ promised by that proposition cannot concentrate. Suppose it did concentrate at some point $\gamma(s) \in \Gamma$, and assume as before that $\|F_n\|_2 \to 1$. By Corollary 26 we know that $\kappa(\gamma(s)) = \lambda$. We may again assume that $\gamma(s)$ is not an endpoint of Γ. Then, by Lemma 35 and Proposition 24,

$$\mathbf{C}[\Gamma] = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|\widehat{F_n\sigma}\|_6 \leq \lim_{r\to 0^+} \lim_{n\to\infty} \|T_{s,r} F_n\|_6 \leq \lim_{r\to 0^+} \|T_{s,r}\| = \mathbf{C}_F[\lambda],$$

a contradiction to Proposition 27. This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.

10. APPENDIX 1: $\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6$ IS TWICE DIFFERENTIABLE AT $\epsilon = 0$

Recall that

$$v_\epsilon(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u) e^{-i(x,t)\cdot(u, \frac{\lambda u^2}{2} + a\epsilon^2 u^4 + \epsilon^{-2}\psi(\epsilon u))} \Big(1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\epsilon^2 u^2\Big) \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} u\Big) du,$$

where $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, $\lambda = \min_\Gamma \kappa$, $G_0(u) = e^{-\lambda u^2/2}$, $\varphi(u) = c_\lambda u e^{-\lambda u^2/2}$, $a \in [\lambda^3/8, 3\lambda^3/16)$, ψ is a real-valued smooth function satisfying $\psi(y) = O(|y|^5)$ as $|y| \to 0$, and η_I is a mollified version of the characteristic function of the interval I.

The main goal of this appendix is to prove the following:

Proposition 36. *The function $\epsilon \mapsto \|v_\epsilon\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^2)}^6$ is twice differentiable at $\epsilon = 0$, and*

$$\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0} \|v_\epsilon\|_6^6 = 18 \iint |G_1|^4 |\varphi_1|^2 dx dt + 12\Re \iint |G_1|^2 \overline{G_1}^2 \varphi_1^2 dx dt + 3\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6 - 8a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6. \tag{79}$$

It is enough to show that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big|\partial_\epsilon |v_\epsilon(x,t)|^6\Big| dx dt \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big|\partial_\epsilon^2 |v_\epsilon(x,t)|^6\Big| dx dt \leq C \tag{80}$$

for a finite constant C (independent of ϵ) and every $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. The existence of $\partial_\epsilon^2|_{\epsilon=0}\|v_\epsilon\|_6^6$ will then follow from standard tools of analysis, and the formal computations from §8.3.1 show that its value is given by formula (79).

For $\epsilon < 1$, set, as in the proof of Proposition 28,

$$G_\epsilon(u) = \Big(1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\epsilon^2 u^2\Big)(G_0 + \epsilon\varphi)(u).$$

We have the following expression for the oscillatory integral:

$$v_\epsilon(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\phi_\epsilon(u)} G_\epsilon(u) \eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} u\Big) du,$$

where

$$\phi_\epsilon(u) := \frac{x}{t}u + \frac{\lambda u^2}{2} + a\epsilon^2 u^4 + \epsilon^{-2}\psi(\epsilon u). \tag{81}$$

In order to present the main estimates for v_ϵ, it is convenient to perform a decomposition of the (x,t)-plane which we now describe. Let $\eta_0, \eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be even and smooth cut-off functions supported in $[-1,1]$ and $[-2,-1/2] \cup [1/2,2]$ respectively, with the properties that $0 \leq \eta_0 \leq 1$, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, and

$$\eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} u\Big) = \eta_0(u) + \sum_{k=1}^{K(\epsilon)} \eta(2^{-k+1}u) \quad \text{for every } u \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{82}$$

This can be accomplished with $2^{K(\epsilon)} \asymp \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. We obtain, in particular, a smooth partition of unity in the interval $\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot I$ subordinate to the dyadic regions $\mathcal{D}_k := \{u \in \mathbb{R} : 2^{k-2} \leq |u| \leq 2^k\}$. This allows us to express v_ϵ as a sum of $\asymp K(\epsilon)$ integrals:

$$v_\epsilon(x,t) = v_{\epsilon,0}(x,t) + \sum_{k=1}^{K(\epsilon)} v_{\epsilon,k}(x,t), \tag{83}$$

where

$$v_{\epsilon,0}(x,t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\phi_\epsilon(u)} G_\epsilon(u) \eta_0(u) du$$

and

$$v_{\epsilon,k}(x,t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\phi_\epsilon(u)} G_\epsilon(u) \eta(2^{-k+1}u) du \tag{84}$$

for $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K(\epsilon)\}$. Define:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{C}_0 := \Big\{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \Big|\frac{x}{t}\Big| \leq \lambda\Big\};\\
&\mathfrak{C}_k := \Big\{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \lambda 2^{k-2} \leq \Big|\frac{x}{t}\Big| \leq \lambda 2^k\Big\}; \quad (k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K(\epsilon)\})\\
&\mathfrak{C}_\infty := \Big\{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \Big|\frac{x}{t}\Big| \geq \lambda \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields a decomposition of the (x,t)-plane as a union of cones

$$\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathfrak{C}_0 \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{K(\epsilon)} \mathfrak{C}_k \cup \mathfrak{C}_\infty. \tag{85}$$

which parallels (82). For $k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, K(\epsilon) - 2\}$, define the "enlarged" cones

$$\mathfrak{C}_k^* := \mathfrak{C}_k \cup \mathfrak{C}_{k\pm1} \cup \mathfrak{C}_{k\pm2}.$$

Additionally, let

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{C}_0^* := \mathfrak{C}_0 \cup \mathfrak{C}_1 \cup \mathfrak{C}_2;\\
&\mathfrak{C}_1^* := \mathfrak{C}_0 \cup \mathfrak{C}_1 \cup \mathfrak{C}_2 \cup \mathfrak{C}_3;\\
&\mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)-1}^* := \mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)-3} \cup \mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)-2} \cup \mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)-1} \cup \mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)} \cup \mathfrak{C}_\infty;\\
&\mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)}^* := \mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)-2} \cup \mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)-1} \cup \mathfrak{C}_{K(\epsilon)} \cup \mathfrak{C}_\infty;
\end{aligned}$$

The estimates in the following proposition are an expression of the *stationary phase principle*, which roughly states that the main contribution for an oscillatory expression like (84) comes from the information concentrated on neighborhoods of the stationary points of its phase function.

Proposition 37. *For $k \in \{1, \ldots, K(\epsilon)\}$ and for every sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $a_k \geq 0$ such that*

$$|v_{\epsilon,k}(x,t)| \lesssim a_k \cdot \begin{cases} \langle t\rangle^{-1/2} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_k^*, \\ \langle t\rangle^{-1} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_0, \\ \langle x\rangle^{-1} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \Big(\bigcup_{|j-k|>2} \mathfrak{C}_j\Big) \cup \mathfrak{C}_\infty. \end{cases}$$

and $\sum_k 2^k a_k < \infty$. If $k = 0$, then

$$|v_{\epsilon,0}(x,t)| \lesssim \begin{cases} \langle t\rangle^{-1/2} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_0^*, \\ \langle x\rangle^{-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. To make the notation less cumbersome, we will limit our discussion to the case when $k \in \{3, 4, \ldots, K(\epsilon) - 2\}$. The other cases follow in a similar way.

Case 1. $(x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_k^*$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $(x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_k^*$ is such that the phase ϕ_ϵ has a critical point in the support of the cut-off function $\eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \cdot\Big)$, for otherwise we could integrate (84) by parts and obtain a better decay in t. This critical point is necessarily unique. In other words, there exists a unique $u_0 \in 2\log\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot I$ such that

$$\frac{d\phi_\epsilon}{du}(u_0) = \frac{x}{t} + \lambda u_0 + 4a\epsilon^2 u_0^3 + \epsilon^{-1}\psi'(\epsilon u_0) = 0. \tag{86}$$

In general one cannot hope to solve this equation explicitly for u_0. However, since $|u_0| \lesssim \log\frac{1}{\epsilon}$, we have that

$$u_0 = -\frac{x}{\lambda t} + O_{a,\psi}(\epsilon).$$

In particular, since $(x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_k^*$, we have that $|u_0| \asymp 2^k$.

Translating $u \mapsto u + u_0$ and defining $\widetilde{\phi}_\epsilon(u) := \phi_\epsilon(u+u_0) - \phi_\epsilon(u_0)$, we have that

$$v_\epsilon(x,t) = e^{-it\phi_\epsilon(u_0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\widetilde{\phi}_\epsilon(u)} G_\epsilon(u+u_0)\eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(u+u_0)\Big)du.$$

It will suffice to get good estimates on

$$\widetilde{v}_\epsilon(x,t) := e^{it\phi_\epsilon(u_0)} v_\epsilon(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\widetilde{\phi}_\epsilon(u)} G_\epsilon(u+u_0)\eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(u+u_0)\Big)du. \tag{87}$$

The new phase function $\widetilde{\phi}_\epsilon$ satisfies

$$\widetilde{\phi}_\epsilon(0) = 0 = \frac{d\widetilde{\phi}_\epsilon}{du}(0) \text{ and } \frac{d^2\widetilde{\phi}_\epsilon}{du^2}(0) = \lambda + O(\epsilon).$$

In particular, the origin is its unique nondegenerate critical point. This property is shared by the quadratic function $v \mapsto \frac{v^2}{2}$. Inspired by the proof[6] of the usual method of stationary phase, we will change variables once again.

---

[6] See, for instance, [23, pp. 334–337].

Recalling definition (81) and identity (86), and using Taylor's formula, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v^2}{2} :=&\widetilde{\phi_\epsilon}(u) = \phi_\epsilon(u+u_0) - \phi_\epsilon(u_0)\\ =&\frac{u^2}{2}\Big((\lambda + 12au_0^2\epsilon^2) + 8au_0\epsilon^2 u + 2a\epsilon^2u^2\Big) + \epsilon^{-2}\psi(\epsilon(u+u_0)) - \epsilon^{-2}\psi(\epsilon u_0) - u\epsilon^{-1}\psi'(\epsilon u_0)\\ =&\frac{u^2}{2}\Big((\lambda + 12au_0^2\epsilon^2) + 8au_0\epsilon^2 u + 2a\epsilon^2u^2 + \psi''(\epsilon(u_0+\theta u))\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for some $\theta \in (0,1)$. Taking square roots,

$$v = u\Big((\lambda + 12au_0^2\epsilon^2) + 8au_0\epsilon^2 u + 2a\epsilon^2u^2 + \psi''(\epsilon(u_0+\theta u))\Big)^{1/2} =: \Phi_\epsilon(u). \tag{88}$$

Take $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Then Φ_ϵ is a C^∞ diffeomorphism from $2\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I$ onto its image, whose inverse we denote by $\Psi_\epsilon := \Phi_\epsilon^{-1}$. One can verify directly that $\frac{d\Phi_\epsilon}{du}(u) > 0$ for every $u \in 2\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I$. As a consequence,

$$\widetilde{v_\epsilon}(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\frac{v^2}{2}} G_\epsilon(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0)\eta_I\Big(\frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0)\Big)\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(v)dv. \tag{89}$$

Rewriting (88) as

$$\Phi_\epsilon(u) =u\Big(\lambda + 2a(2u_0^2 + (2u_0+u)^2)\epsilon^2 + \psi''(\epsilon(u_0+\theta u))\Big)^{1/2} \tag{90}$$

and recalling that $\lambda, a > 0$ and $\psi''(\epsilon(u_0+\theta u)) = O(\epsilon^3)$, we see that Φ_ϵ is twice differentiable as a function of ϵ for sufficiently small ϵ. The same holds for $\frac{d\Phi_\epsilon}{du}$, and using the chain rule one can draw similar conclusions about Ψ_ϵ and $\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}$.

In what follows, C will be a finite non-zero constant that may change from line to line and depend on the parameters λ, a, the function ψ and the interval I but will always be independent of ϵ, x and t. This uniformity is crucial in our analysis.

We proceed to prove some uniform (in ϵ) bounds for $\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}$ and $\frac{d^2\Psi_\epsilon}{dv^2}$. Start by observing that, for every sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$,

$$C^{-1}|u| \leq |\Phi_\epsilon(u)| \leq C|u|, \quad \forall u \in 2\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I.$$

Since $\Phi_\epsilon \circ \Psi_\epsilon = id$ on $\Phi_\epsilon(2\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I) \subseteq C\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I$, we have the same uniform bounds for Ψ_ϵ:

$$C^{-1}|v| \leq |\Psi_\epsilon(v)| \leq C|v|, \quad \forall v \in C\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I. \tag{91}$$

We also have the uniform bounds

$$C^{-1} \leq \Big|\frac{d\Phi_\epsilon}{du}(u)\Big| \leq C, \quad \forall u \in 2\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I. \tag{92}$$

By the inverse function theorem,

$$\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(v) = \frac{1}{\frac{d\Phi_\epsilon}{du}(\Psi_\epsilon(v))}, \tag{93}$$

and so (92) implies

$$C^{-1} \leq \Big|\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(v)\Big| \leq C, \quad \forall v \in C\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I. \tag{94}$$

Only the upper bound will be useful to us. In a similar way one can conclude that

$$\Big|\frac{d^2\Psi_\epsilon}{dv^2}(v)\Big| \leq C, \quad \forall v \in C\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I. \tag{95}$$

We also need to estimate the Gaussian term G_ϵ appearing in (89) and some of its derivatives. The following claim, whose proof is straightforward and therefore omitted, provides good enough bounds:

Claim 38. *The following uniform estimates hold for every sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, for every nonnegative integer n and for every $u \in 2\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I$:*

$$\Big|\frac{d^n}{du^n}G_\epsilon(u)\Big| \lesssim_n \langle u\rangle^n e^{-\frac{\lambda u^2}{2}}.$$

Let us go back to (89). Introducing the cut-off functions η and η_0 as before, we can expand

$$\widetilde{v}_\epsilon(x,t) = \widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,0}(x,t) + \sum_{k=1}^{K(\epsilon)}\widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,k}(x,t), \tag{96}$$

where

$$\widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,0}(x,t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\frac{v^2}{2}}G_\epsilon(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0)\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(v)\eta_0(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0)dv$$

and

$$\widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,k}(x,t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\frac{v^2}{2}}G_\epsilon(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0)\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(v)\eta(2^{-k+1}(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0))dv$$

for $k \in \{1,\dots,K(\epsilon)\}$. As before, $|\widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,k}| = |v_{\epsilon,k}|$ pointwise.

Define:

$$b_\epsilon(v) := G_\epsilon(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0)\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(v) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k(v) := \eta(2^{-k+1}(\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0)). \tag{97}$$

Notice that $\eta_k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is supported on

$$\mathcal{E}_k := \{v \in C\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\cdot I : 2^{k-2} \leq |\Psi_\epsilon(v)+u_0| \leq 2^k\},$$

and that b_ϵ is a Schwartz function on $\mathcal{E}_k$. This justifies the use of Plancherel's Theorem:

$$\widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,k}(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\frac{v^2}{2}}b_\epsilon(v)\eta_k(v)dv = (-2\pi i)^{1/2}t^{-1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{it^{-1}\frac{\xi^2}{2}}\widehat{b_\epsilon\eta_k}(\xi)d\xi.$$

Set $a_k := \|\widehat{b_\epsilon \eta_k}\|_{L^1}$. We will be done analyzing Case 1 once we verify that the sequence $\{a_k\}_k$ decays rapidly enough to force the series $\sum_k 2^k a_k$ to converge.

We start by estimating the L^2 norm of the function $b_\epsilon \eta_k$. Changing back to the original variable $u = \Psi_\epsilon(v)$ and using Hölder's inequality together with estimate (94) and Claim 38 for $n = 0$, one gets that

$$\begin{aligned}\|b_\epsilon \eta_k\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int \Big| G_\epsilon(\Psi_\epsilon(v) + u_0) \frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(v) \eta(2^{-k+1}(\Psi_\epsilon(v) + u_0)) \Big|^2 dv \\ &\le \int_{|u+u_0| \asymp 2^k} \Big| G_\epsilon(u + u_0) \eta(2^{-k+1}(u + u_0)) \Big|^2 \Big| \frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}(\Phi_\epsilon(u)) \Big| du \lesssim 2^k e^{-\lambda 4^{k-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

An analogous argument, using estimate (95) instead, yields

$$\Big\| \frac{d}{dv}(b_\epsilon \eta_k) \Big\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim 2^{3k} e^{-\lambda 4^{k-1}}.$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz and Plancherel, we see that these two estimates are enough for our purposes:

$$\begin{aligned}a_k = \|\widehat{b_\epsilon \eta_k}\|_{L^1} &= \int_{|\xi| \le 1} |\widehat{b_\epsilon \eta_k}(\xi)| d\xi + \int_{|\xi| \ge 1} \frac{1}{|\xi|} \Big(|\xi| |\widehat{b_\epsilon \eta_k}(\xi)| \Big) d\xi \\ &\lesssim \|\widehat{b_\epsilon \eta_k}\|_{L^2} + \Big(\int_{|\xi| \ge 1} |\xi|^{-2} d\xi \Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{|\xi| \ge 1} |\xi|^2 |\widehat{b_\epsilon \eta_k}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \Big)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \|b_\epsilon \eta_k\|_{L^2} + \Big\| \frac{d}{du}(b_\epsilon \eta_k) \Big\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{3k/2} e^{-\lambda 2^{2k-3}}.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the analysis of Case 1.

Case 2. $(x, t) \in \mathfrak{C}_0$

The crucial observation is that, since $(x, t) \in \mathfrak{C}_0$ and $k > 2$, the phase ϕ_ϵ has no critical points in the support of $\eta(2^{-k+1} \cdot)$ i.e. the dyadic region $\mathcal{D}_k = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : 2^{k-2} \le |u| \le 2^k\}$. Indeed, since $|\frac{x}{t}| \le \lambda$, we have that

$$\Big| \frac{d\phi_\epsilon}{du}(u) \Big| = \Big| \frac{x}{t} + \lambda u + O(\epsilon) \Big| \ge \frac{1}{2} \Big(|\lambda u| - \Big| \frac{x}{t} \Big| \Big) \ge \frac{\lambda}{2}(2^{k-2} - 1) \ge \frac{\lambda}{2} \tag{98}$$

if $\epsilon > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small.

Integrating (84) by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned}|v_{\epsilon,k}(x, t)| &= \frac{1}{|t|} \Big| \int_{\mathcal{D}_k} e^{-it\phi_\epsilon(u)} \frac{d}{du} \Big(\frac{G_\epsilon(u) \eta(2^{-k+1} u)}{\frac{d\phi_\epsilon}{du}(u)} \Big) du \Big| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{|t|} \int_{\mathcal{D}_k} \Big| \frac{\frac{d}{du}(G_\epsilon(u) \eta(2^{-k+1} u))}{\frac{d\phi_\epsilon}{du}(u)} \Big| + \Big| \frac{G_\epsilon(u) \eta(2^{-k+1} u) \frac{d^2\phi_\epsilon}{du^2}(u)}{(\frac{d\phi_\epsilon}{du}(u))^2} \Big| du.\end{aligned}$$

Hölder's inequality implies

$$|v_{\epsilon,k}(x, t)| \lesssim \frac{2^k}{|t|} \Big(\Big\| \frac{\frac{d}{du}(G_\epsilon \eta(2^{-k+1} \cdot))}{\frac{d\phi_\epsilon}{du}} \Big\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_k)} + \Big\| \frac{G_\epsilon \eta(2^{-k+1} \cdot) \frac{d^2\phi_\epsilon}{du^2}}{(\frac{d\phi_\epsilon}{du})^2} \Big\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_k)} \Big),$$

and the desired estimate[7] now follows from (98), Claim 38 and the fact that $\frac{d^2\phi_\epsilon}{du^2}$ is uniformly bounded on $\mathcal{D}_k$.

Case 3. $(x,t)\in\mathfrak{C}_j$ for some j such that $|k-j|>2,$ or $(x,t)\in\mathfrak{C}_\infty$ The proof is identical to that of Case 2 and is therefore omitted. $\square$

Let us go back to the proof of Proposition 36. Observe that the estimates from Proposition 37 readily imply the following special case of the $L^2\to L^6$ adjoint restriction inequality:

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|v_\epsilon(x,t)|^6dxdt\leq C. \tag{99}$$

Indeed, using the expansion (83), we have that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|v_\epsilon(x,t)|^6dxdt=\sum_{k_1,\dots,k_6}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}v_{\epsilon,k_1}\overline{v_{\epsilon,k_2}}v_{\epsilon,k_3}\overline{v_{\epsilon,k_4}}v_{\epsilon,k_5}\overline{v_{\epsilon,k_6}}dxdt$$

where, for each $j\in\{1,\dots,6\}$, the sum is taken over $k_j\in\{0,1,\dots,K(\epsilon)\}$. For a fixed $(k_1,\dots,k_6)$ the corresponding integral can be written as a sum of $\asymp K(\epsilon)$ integrals over the regions given by decomposition (85), and using the bounds given by Proposition 37 on each of these regions one readily obtains (99). Note that

$$\iint_{\mathfrak{C}_k}\langle t\rangle^{-3}dxdt\asymp 2^k,$$

and so it is crucial to know that $\sum_k 2^k a_k<\infty$.

To prove (80), it is enough to control the following integrals:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_0(\epsilon)&:=\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|v_\epsilon(x,t)|^5|\partial_\epsilon v_\epsilon(x,t)|dxdt;\\
I_1(\epsilon)&:=\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|v_\epsilon(x,t)|^5|\partial_\epsilon^2 v_\epsilon(x,t)|dxdt;\\
I_2(\epsilon)&:=\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|v_\epsilon(x,t)|^4|\partial_\epsilon v_\epsilon(x,t)|^2dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

The reasoning just described to prove (99) can be used to establish bounds for the integrals $I_0(\epsilon)$, $I_1(\epsilon)$ and $I_2(\epsilon)$ which are uniform in ϵ, as long as we have an analogue of Proposition 37 for first and second derivatives. As before, bounds for $\partial_\epsilon\widetilde{v}_\epsilon$ and $\partial_\epsilon^2\widetilde{v}_\epsilon$ will suffice. Let us focus on the more involved case of second derivatives:

---

[7] One could repeat this argument N times and obtain a bound $|v_{\epsilon,k}(x,t)|\lesssim_{k,N}\langle t\rangle^{-N}$ for $(x,t)\in\mathfrak{C}_0$, but this extra knowledge would be of no significance to our analysis.

Proposition 39. *For* $k \in \{1, \ldots, K(\epsilon)\}$ *and for every sufficiently small* $\epsilon > 0$*, there exist* $b_k \geq 0$ *such that*

$$|\partial_\epsilon^2 \widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,k}(x,t)| \lesssim b_k \cdot \begin{cases} \langle t \rangle^{-1/2} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_k^*, \\ \langle t \rangle^{-1} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_0, \\ \langle x \rangle^{-1} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \left(\bigcup_{|j-k|>2} \mathfrak{C}_j\right) \cup \mathfrak{C}_\infty. \end{cases}$$

and $\sum_k 2^k b_k < \infty$*. If* $k = 0$*, then*

$$|\partial_\epsilon^2 \widetilde{v}_{\epsilon,0}(x,t)| \lesssim \begin{cases} \langle t \rangle^{-1/2} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \mathfrak{C}_0^*, \\ \langle x \rangle^{-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The proof follows the same steps of Proposition 37, with only one difference:

We need appropriate bounds for $\partial_\epsilon\left(\frac{d^j \Psi_\epsilon}{dv^j}\right)$ *and* $\partial_\epsilon^2\left(\frac{d^j \Psi_\epsilon}{dv^j}\right)$ *for* $j \in \{1, 2\}$*.*

Let us briefly outline how to accomplish this. Using (88), we have that

$$\Phi_\epsilon(\Psi_\epsilon(v)) = \Psi_\epsilon(v)\Big(\lambda + (12au_0^2 + 8au_0\Psi_\epsilon(v) + 2a\Psi_\epsilon(v)^2)\epsilon^2 + \psi''(\epsilon(u_0 + \theta\Psi_\epsilon(v)))\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Differentiate both sides of the last identity with respect to ϵ, the left hand side being obviously equal to 0. For the right hand side, we get two kinds of terms, depending on whether or not they contain a factor of the form $\partial_\epsilon \Psi_\epsilon$. Grouping together in one side of the equation all the terms which do contain such a factor, we can estimate:

$$|\partial_\epsilon \Psi_\epsilon(v)| \leq C, \quad \forall v \in C \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot I. \tag{100}$$

It is also elementary to show that

$$\left|\partial_\epsilon\Big(\frac{d\Phi_\epsilon}{du}\Big)(u)\right| \leq C, \quad \forall u \in 2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot I. \tag{101}$$

Differentiating both sides of (93) with respect to ϵ, we obtain

$$\partial_\epsilon\Big(\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}\Big)(v) = -\frac{\partial_\epsilon\Big(\frac{d\Phi_\epsilon}{du}(\Psi_\epsilon(v))\Big)}{\Big(\frac{d\Phi_\epsilon}{du}(\Psi_\epsilon(v))\Big)^2}.$$

Using estimates (92) and (100), we similarly conclude that

$$\left|\partial_\epsilon\Big(\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}\Big)(v)\right| \leq C, \quad \forall v \in C \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot I. \tag{102}$$

Repeating this whole procedure once again, we conclude in an analogous way that

$$\left|\partial_\epsilon^2\Big(\frac{d\Psi_\epsilon}{dv}\Big)(v)\right| \leq Cv^2, \quad \forall v \in C \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot I. \tag{103}$$

The terms $\partial_\epsilon\left(\frac{d^2\Psi_\epsilon}{dv^2}\right)$ and $\partial_\epsilon^2\left(\frac{d^2\Psi_\epsilon}{dv^2}\right)$ can be dealt with in a similar way. Recalling what we already know from (94) and (95), we arrive at the following lemma:

Lemma 40. *The following estimates hold for* $j \in \{1, 2\}$*, for every sufficiently small* $\epsilon > 0$ *and for every* $v \in C \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot I$*:*

(i) $\left|\frac{d^j\Psi_\epsilon}{dv^j}(v)\right| \leq C$;
(ii) $\left|\partial_\epsilon\Big(\frac{d^j\Psi_\epsilon}{dv^j}\Big)(v)\right| \leq C$;
(iii) $\left|\partial_\epsilon^2\Big(\frac{d^j\Psi_\epsilon}{dv^j}\Big)(v)\right| \leq Cv^2$.

Lemma 40 can be used together with the estimates from Claim 38 to prove Proposition 39. We omit the details.

11. Appendix 2: Two explicit calculations

Claim 32.

$$3\lambda^2\Re\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|G_1(x,t)|^4\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_2(x,t)dxdt = \frac{3}{2}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6. \tag{104}$$

Proof. As first observations, note that

$$\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_2(x,t) = \Big(\lambda^{-1}(1+it)^{-1} - \lambda^{-2}x^2(1+it)^{-2}\Big)|G_1(x,t)|^2 \tag{105}$$

and

$$|G_1(x,t)|^2 = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda}(1+t^2)^{-1/2}e^{-\frac{x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}.$$

It follows that the left hand side in (104) equals

$$3\lambda^2\Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^3\Re\iint\Big(\lambda^{-1}(1+it)^{-1} - \lambda^{-2}x^2(1+it)^{-2}\Big)(1+t^2)^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt.$$

Write $(1+it)^{-1} = (1+t^2)^{-1}(1-it)$, $(1+it)^{-2} = (1+t^2)^{-2}(1-it)^2$, and change variables $y = \frac{x}{(1+t^2)^{1/2}}$ to compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I} := \Re\iint(1+t^2)^{-1}(1-it)(1+t^2)^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt = &\iint(1+t^2)^{-5/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt\\ =&\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(1+t^2)^2}dt\Big)\cdot\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}e^{-\frac{3y^2}{\lambda}}dy\Big)\\ =&\frac{\pi}{2}\cdot\Big(\frac{\pi}{3/\lambda}\Big)^{1/2} = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{3}}\lambda^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{II} :=&\Re\iint x^2(1+t^2)^{-2}(1-it)^2(1+t^2)^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt\\ =&\iint(1+t^2)^{-7/2}(1-t^2)x^2e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt\\ =&\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{1-t^2}{(1+t^2)^2}dt\Big)\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}y^2e^{-\frac{3y^2}{\lambda}}dy\Big) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

All in all we have that

$$3\lambda^2\Re\iint |G_1(x,t)|^4\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_2(x,t)dxdt = 3\lambda^2\Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^3(\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I}-\lambda^{-2}\mathbf{II}) = 3\lambda^{-2}(2\pi)^3\mathbf{I}+0$$
$$=\frac{3}{2}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\frac{(2\pi)^3}{\sqrt{3}}\lambda^{-1} = \frac{3}{2}\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-1/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6. \qquad \square$$

Claim 33.

$$-6a\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}\Re\Big\{it|G_1(x,t)|^4\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_3(x,t)\Big\}dxdt = -4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6. \tag{106}$$

Proof. As with (105), we have that

$$\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_3(x,t) = \Big(3\lambda^{-2}(1+it)^{-2} - 6\lambda^{-3}x^2(1+it)^{-3} + \lambda^{-4}x^4(1+it)^{-4}\Big)|G_1(x,t)|^2,$$

and so the left hand side in (106) equals

$$-6a\Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^3\iint\Re\Big\{it\Big(3\lambda^{-2}(1+it)^{-2} - 6\lambda^{-3}x^2(1+it)^{-3} + \lambda^{-4}x^4(1+it)^{-4}\Big)\cdot$$
$$\cdot(1+t^2)^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}\Big\}dxdt.$$

Note that $\Re\{i(1+it)^{-2}\} = 2t(1+t^2)^{-2}$, $\Re\{i(1+it)^{-3}\} = (3t-t^3)(1+t^2)^{-3}$ and $\Re\{i(1+it)^{-4}\} = (4t-4t^3)(1+t^2)^{-4}$. Change variables $y=\frac{x}{(1+t^2)^{1/2}}$ to compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I} :=& \iint 2t^2(1+t^2)^{-2}(1+t^2)^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt = \iint 2t^2(1+t^2)^{-7/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt\\ =&\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{2t^2}{(1+t^2)^3}dt\Big)\cdot\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}e^{-\frac{3y^2}{\lambda}}dy\Big)\\ =&\frac{\pi}{4}\cdot\Big(\frac{\pi}{3/\lambda}\Big)^{1/2} = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{4\sqrt{3}}\lambda^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{II} :=& \iint x^2(3t^2-t^4)(1+t^2)^{-3}(1+t^2)^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt\\ =&\iint(3t^2-t^4)(1+t^2)^{-9/2}x^2e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}dxdt\\ =&\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{3t^2-t^4}{(1+t^2)^3}dt\Big)\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}y^2e^{-\frac{3y^2}{\lambda}}dy\Big) = 0\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{III} :=& \iint x^4(4t^2-4t^4)(1+t^2)^{-4}(1+t^2)^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}\,dxdt\\
=&\iint (4t^2-4t^4)(1+t^2)^{-11/2}x^4e^{-\frac{3x^2}{\lambda(1+t^2)}}\,dxdt\\
=&\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{4t^2-4t^4}{(1+t^2)^3}dt\Big)\cdot\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}y^4e^{-\frac{3y^2}{\lambda}}dy\Big)\\
=&-\pi\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{12}\Big(\frac{\pi}{3/\lambda}\Big)^{1/2}\Big)=-\frac{\pi^{3/2}}{12\sqrt{3}}\lambda^{5/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

All in all we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
-6a\iint \Re\Big\{it|G_1(x,t)|^4\overline{G_1(x,t)}G_3(x,t)\Big\}dxdt &= -6a\Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^3(3\lambda^{-2}\mathbf{I}-6\lambda^{-3}\mathbf{II}+\lambda^{-4}\mathbf{III})\\
&=-a(18\lambda^{-2}\mathbf{I}+0+6\lambda^{-4}\mathbf{III})\Big(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\Big)^3\\
&=-\Big(\frac{18}{4}-\frac{6}{12}\Big)a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\frac{(2\pi)^3}{\sqrt{3}}\lambda^{-1}\\
&=-4a\pi^{3/2}\lambda^{-7/2}\mathbf{C}_F[\lambda]^6,
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. ☐

References

[1] J.-G. Bak and D. McMichael, *Convolution of a measure with itself and a restriction theorem.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), no. 2, 463-470.

[2] H. Brezis and E. Lieb, *A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **88** (1983), no. 3, 486-490.

[3] L. Carleson and P. Sjölin, *Oscillatory integrals and a multiplier problem for the disc.* Studia Math. **44** (1972), 287-299.

[4] E. Carneiro, *A sharp inequality for the Strichartz norm.* Int. Math. Res. Not. **16** (2009), 3127-3145.

[5] M. Christ, *On extremals for a Radon-like transform.* Preprint, arXiv:1106.0728v1 (2011).

[6] M. Christ and R. Quilodrán, *Gaussians rarely extremize adjoint Fourier restiction inequalities for paraboloids.* Preprint, arXiv:1012.1346 (2010). To appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.

[7] M. Christ and S. Shao, *Existence of extremals for a Fourier restriction inequality.* Preprint, arXiv:1006.4319 (2010). To appear in Anal. PDE.

[8] ———, *On the extremizers of an adjoint restriction inequality.* Preprint, arXiv:1006.4318 (2010).

[9] T. Duyckaerts, F. Merle and S. Roudenko, *Maximizers for the Strichartz norm for small solutions of mass-critical NLS.* Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **10** (2011), no. 2, 427-476.

[10] C. Fefferman, *Inequalities for strongly singular convolution operators.* Acta Math. **124** (1970), 9-36.

[11] L. Fanelli, L. Vega and N. Visciglia, *On the existence of maximizers for a family of restriction theorems.* Bull. London Math. Soc. **43** (2011), no. 4, 811-817.

[12] ———, *Existence of maximizers for Sobolev-Strichartz inequalities.* Adv. Math. **229** (2012), no. 3, 1912-1923.

[13] D. Foschi, *Maximizers for the Strichartz inequality.* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **9** (2007), no. 4, 739-774.

[14] D. Hundertmark and V. Zharnitsky, *On sharp Strichartz inequalities in low dimensions.* Int. Math. Res. Not. (2006), Art. ID 34080.

[15] M. Kunze, *On the existence of a maximizer for the Strichartz inequality.* Comm. Math. Phys. **243** (2003), no. 1, 137-162.

[16] P.-L. Lions, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. I.* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **1** (1984), no. 2, 109-145.

[17] A. Moyua, A. Vargas and L. Vega, *Restriction theorems and maximal operators related to oscillatory integrals in* $\mathbb{R}^3$. Duke. Math. J. **96** (1999), no. 3, 547-574.

[18] R. O'Neil, *Convolution operators and* $L(p, q)$ *spaces.* Duke Math. J. **30** (1963), 129-142.

[19] D. Oliveira e Silva, *Nonexistence of extremizers for certain convex curves.* In preparation.

[20] R. Quilodrán, *On extremizers for adjoint Fourier restriction inequalities and a result in incidence geometry.* Ph.D. thesis (2011).

[21] ———, *On extremizing sequences for the adjoint restriction inequality on the cone.* Preprint, arXiv: 1108.6081 (2011). To appear in J. London Math. Soc.

[22] ———, *Nonexistence of extremals for the adjoint restriction inequality on the hyperboloid.* Preprint, arXiv: 1108.6324 (2011). To appear in Jour. Anal. Math.

[23] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[24] R. Strichartz, *Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations.* Duke Math. J. **44** (1977), no. 3, 705-714.

[25] T. Tao, *Some Recent Progress on the Restriction Conjecture.* Fourier analysis and convexity, 217-243, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2004.

[26] P. Tomas, *A restriction theorem for the Fourier transform.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1975), no. 2, 477-478.

Diogo Oliveira e Silva, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, USA

E-mail address: `dosilva@math.berkeley.edu`